

Also, memorial of Superintendents and Foremen's Association and Associated Shoe Industry, of Philadelphia and vicinity, in re pneumatic-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mrs. J. Gilbert Meares, of Hohokus, N. J., for woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of the Brooklyn Civic Club, of Brooklyn, N. Y., opposing the discontinuance of the pneumatic-tube service in that city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of De Kalb (Ill.) Aerie, No. 1316, Fraternal Order of Eagles, opposing increase of postal rates on fraternal magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Central Federated Union of Greater New York and vicinity, against House bill 18986; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Common Council of the city of Philadelphia, opposing the abandonment of the pneumatic-tube service in that city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Winnebago National Bank, of Richfield, Ill., concerning proposed amendments to the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Central Federated Union of Greater New York, opposing prohibitory legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of rural mail carriers of the twelfth district of Illinois, for readjustment of salaries and for maintenance allowances; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorials of the Massachusetts Legislature, in re old-age pensions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Boston Wool Trade Association, in re water rates on wool; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY of Indiana: Petition and statement by Sennil E. Vertreez, Richmond, Ind., favoring legislation to prevent the slaughter of young cattle under certain ages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GUERNSEY: Petition of rural carriers at Houlton, Springfield, Lisbon, Auburn, Newport, Dixmont, Oakfield, Milo, Fort Fairfield, Brownville, and Carmel, all in the State of Maine, asking consideration of bill to fix compensation of carriers upon an equitable and specific basis; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 17446, for relief of Chauncy A. Crook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Papers to accompany House bill for relief of Nathan M. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of John Salzu, secretary, East Liverpool, Ohio, against prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of 59 residents of the city of St. Louis, protesting against the enactment of House bill 18986, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Bohemian-Slavonia Benevolent Association of St. Louis, filed by August Triska, secretary, favoring an additional appropriation for the field service of the Bureau of Naturalization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition filed by Mr. Charles Jerabek, secretary of the American-Bohemian Citizens' League of St. Louis, Mo., favoring an additional appropriation for the field service of the Bureau of Naturalization; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Bohemian Gymnastic Association of St. Louis, Mo., favoring an additional appropriation for the field service of the Naturalization Bureau; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KING: Petition of the Quincy Order of Eagles, signed by Mr. P. W. Reardon, president, and O. F. Robb, secretary, of Quincy, Ill., protesting against passage of section 10 of House bill 19410; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the Henry County Antisaloan League, signed by Mr. C. W. Watson, president, of Kewanee, Ill., praying for the passage of all temperance measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Memorial passed January 10, 1917, by Select and Common Councils of Philadelphia, objecting to discontinuance of pneumatic-tube service in that city; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of H. A. Bokel, of Baltimore, against prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of J. A. Bokel Co., of Baltimore, Md., in re postal legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of E. Raine, of Baltimore, opposing House bill 18986; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MOORES of Indiana: Petition of 95 citizens of Indianapolis, Ind., asking for the passage of the Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NOLAN: Petition from Mr. Leon Sloss, president Northern Commercial Co., San Francisco, Cal., asking that the Territory of Alaska be not declared by law to be dry before January 1, 1918; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. OVERMYER: Petitions of 384 citizens of Sandusky and Erie County, Ohio, protesting against the enactment of the following bills: House bill 18986, by Congressman RANDALL; Senate bill 4429, by Senator BANKHEAD; Senate bill 1082, by Senator SHEPPARD; House joint resolution 84, by Congressman WEBB; and House bill 17850, by Congressman HOWARD; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN: Petition of sundry citizens of New York, against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REILLY: Petitions of the citizens of Fond du Lac, opposing House bill 18986, Randall mail-exclusion bill; Senate bill 4429, Bankhead mail-exclusion bill; Senate bill 1082, Sheppard District of Columbia prohibition bill; House joint resolution 84, Webb nation-wide prohibition bill; and House bill 17850, Howard bill, to prohibit commerce in intoxicating liquors between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petitions of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, against prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SINNOTT: Petitions of 13 people of Klamath Falls, 20 people of Klamath Falls, 14 people of Klamath Falls, and 15 people of Klamath Falls, Oreg., for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Resolutions adopted by the Fairfax-Andover Social Club, of Crookston, Minn., protesting against the proposed embargo on foodstuffs and farm products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of 193 voting members of the Swedish Baptist Church of Fergus Falls, Minn., for a law requiring or permitting daily Bible readings in public schools; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Petition of sundry citizens of Massachusetts, opposing prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of employees of the customs district of Massachusetts, for increase in salaries; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of Massachusetts Legislature, in re "old-age pensions"; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TREADWAY: Petitions of sundry citizens of Westfield and Springfield, Mass., against the passage by Congress of House bill 18986, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Berkshire County and vicinity, for members of Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-Way Employees to be included in workings of the eight-hour-day law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Greenfield, Mass., for suffrage amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, January 17, 1917.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We come before Thee, Almighty God, that we may discharge faithfully and well the duties of this day. Help us to make permanent and secure the things that are true; help us to change the things that are false, and apply the principles of Divine revelation to all the problems of life. To this end do Thou give to us the power to look upon the issues that are before us from God's point of view and to decide the questions that are at issue in the light of that righteousness which Thou hast revealed to us in Thy word. Above all, give us a regard for God's name and the honor and glory of Thy kingdom in the earth. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The VICE PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.  
The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Brady	Hollis	Oliver	Smoot
Brandegee	Husting	Overman	Sterling
Bryan	James	Page	Stone
Chamberlain	Johnson, Me.	Phelan	Sutherland
Chilton	Johnson, S. Dak.	Pittman	Swanson
Clapp	Jones	PoinDEXTER	Thomas
Clark	Kenyon	Ransdell	Thompson
Colt	La Follette	Robinson	Tillman
Culberson	Lewis	Saulsbury	Vardaman
Curtis	Lodge	Shafroth	Wadsworth
Fernald	McCumber	Sheppard	Walsh
Fletcher	McLean	Sherman	Williams
Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Shields	Works
Gronna	Myers	Smith, Ga.	
Hitchcock	Nelson	Smith, Md.	

Mr. JONES. I desire to state that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I was requested to announce that the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is detained from the Senate because of illness in his family.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I rise to announce the absence of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. CHILTON. My colleague [Mr. GORF] is absent on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Fifty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Secretary will read the Journal of the proceedings of the preceding session.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Monday, January 15, 1917, when, on request of Mr. POINDEXTER, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### ELECTORAL VOTES.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting, pursuant to law, authentic copies of the certificates of the final ascertainment of electors for President and Vice President of the United States chosen at the election on the 7th day of November, 1916, in the States of New Jersey, Nebraska, Nevada, South Dakota, and Wyoming, together with a supplemental certificate from Texas, which were ordered to be filed.

#### THE MILITARY ACADEMY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of a report of the board appointed to ascertain the needs of the Military Academy, together with a copy of a letter from the Superintendent of the Military Academy on the subject, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 194) providing for the filling of a vacancy which will occur March 1, 1917, in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, of the class other than Members of Congress.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 19410) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 10384) to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. OLIVER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Luzerne, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor advertisements from the mail, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a memorial from Typographical Union No. 270, of New Castle, Pa., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing a zone system for all second-class mail, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., praying for the enactment of legislation to found the Government on Christianity, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I present a memorial from the Legislature of the State of Washington, in favor of an amendment to the Constitution providing for national prohibition, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The memorial was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF WASHINGTON,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,  
Olympia, January 11, 1917.

Hon. MILES POINDEXTER, M. C.,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with the provisions of senate joint memorial No. 1 of the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Washington, I am inclosing herewith certified copy of the memorial passed on January 8, 1917.

Yours, very truly,

I. M. HOWELL,  
Secretary of State.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
THE STATE OF WASHINGTON,  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

To all to whom these presents shall come:

I, I. M. Howell, secretary of state of the State of Washington, and custodian of the seal of said State, do hereby certify that I have carefully compared the annexed copy of senate joint memorial No. 1 of the fifteenth session of the Legislature of the State of Washington with the original copy of said memorial, as enrolled, now on file in this office, and find the same to be a full, true, and correct copy of said original, and of the whole thereof, together with all official indorsements thereon.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed hereto the seal of the State of Washington. Done at the Capitol, at Olympia, this 11th day of January, A. D. 1917.

[SEAL.]

I. M. HOWELL,  
Secretary of State.

Senate joint memorial No. 1.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

Your memorialists, the members of the Fifteenth Legislature of the State of Washington, respectfully represent:

Whereas it appears that a majority of the people of the United States are in favor of prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors for use as a beverage; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a measure proposing an amendment to the Federal Constitution designed to effect such prohibition:

Wherefore your memorialists pray that such measure proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States so prohibiting the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors be passed immediately and submitted to the several States for ratification.

The secretary of state is hereby directed to furnish a certified copy of this memorial to each of our Senators and Representatives in Congress. Passed the senate January 8, 1917.

LOUIS F. HART,  
President of the Senate.

Passed the house January 8, 1917.

GUY E. KELLY,  
Speaker of the House.

(Indorsed:) Filed 12.13 p. m., January 10, 1917.

I. M. HOWELL,  
Secretary of State.  
By J. GRANT HINKLE,  
Assistant Secretary of State.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a letter in the form of a memorial from the North Dakota State Federation of Labor, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH DAKOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,  
Grand Forks, N. Dak., January 12, 1917.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: There is before the Congress of the United States a rider to the Post Office appropriation bill which the members of the State Federation of Labor of the State of North Dakota believe is going to work a great hardship upon hundreds of thousands of people in the United States, especially in the printing trades.

There is no question but what if this rider is passed in its present form, it is bound to put completely out of business a great number of nationally circulated newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals.

You gentlemen have heard enough of the print-paper situation to know that the daily papers, magazines, and all allied products are now laboring under a strain which has already forced a large number entirely out of business, and which seriously threatens the life of even our largest and strongest periodicals. To add the burden of increased postal rates at the present time will be placing the last straw upon the camel's back, and a great many will sink under the load.

You may not be sufficiently familiar with the printing business to realize what a very large portion of the expense of any periodical is invested in labor which it employs in the form of editors, reporters, linotype operators, stereotypers, pressmen, binders, and various other kinds of allied labor. Therefore, you may not realize that when a printing establishment is put out of business it forces out of employment a larger proportion of individual citizens to the volume of business done than most any other line of endeavor.

We can not too forcibly impress upon you the untold hardships that the enforcement of the zone-rate plan will bring to our vast body of people who are endeavoring to become good citizens of the State of North Dakota and of the United States.

If action on this bill can even be deferred until after the news-print situation becomes normal again, it will prove a great relief to all periodical publishers and will insure continued employment for many

who will doubtless be forced to seek vocations other than those for which they are equipped, should the bill be passed in its present form. Therefore the State Federation of Labor of the State of North Dakota trusts that you will use every effort to defeat or even delay the passage of this measure. May we have an expression from you?  
Respectfully submitted.

NORTH DAKOTA STATE FEDERATION OF LABOR,  
WM. ENGLISH, Secretary.

Mr. GRONNA. I also present a letter from Dr. Aline Bradley, legislative superintendent of the Fourth Division Drys, of Fairbanks, Alaska, which I should like to have printed in the RECORD. It refers to prohibition. It shows that out of 12,000 votes cast in the election, more than 8,000 votes were cast in favor of abolishing the saloon. It also has reference to the school question. If it has not been printed, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOURTH DIVISION DRYS,  
Fairbanks, Alaska, December 20, 1916.

HON. ASLE J. GRONNA,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: You are aware that Alaska voted dry on November 7 by a majority of more than 2 to 1 in her four judicial divisions.

You will admit that when the Alaska of dance-hall, gambling, and saloon fame thus registers her protest against the liquor traffic—when more than 8,000 voters out of approximately 12,000 sign their names to such a gigantic petition against alcohol—the petitioners are entitled to their demand.

Make no mistake, liquor has had the ruling hand in Alaska as well as the robbing hand, hence the vote against it; which vote was not simply a protest against alcohol, but even more a vote against Alaska's rule by alcohol in all channels—local, Territorial, and judicial.

The plebiscite asked that Alaska be made dry after January 1, 1918. There is no good reason, however, why Alaska should wait for the memorial from her Territorial legislature before securing the passage of a bill by Congress prohibiting the sale, manufacture, and importation of alcoholic beverages into Alaska.

We therefore beg to ask your earnest consideration of the reasons why Alaska's prohibition bill should be passed during the present session of Congress.

1. Section 410, Compiled Laws of Alaska, creating a Legislative Assembly for Alaska provides that "the authority herein granted \* \* \* shall not extend to \* \* \* the establishment and maintenance of schools \* \* \*."

Before the 1917 spring session, the authority of the Alaska Territorial Legislature as regards the "establishment and maintenance of" her schools must be given with absolute certainty. Otherwise the school revenue, which will begin to fall as licenses expire in 1917, would not be replaced in time; district schools (Nelson) would be closed for lack of funds, while those in incorporated towns would be crippled for the same reason. Our helpless Territorial legislature could not remedy the condition until its next session in the spring of 1919.

Alaska's children simply can not face two years without proper school revenue.

2. Barring the beers of domestic manufacture, all liquors consumed in Alaska come into the southeastern portion through its ports of entry and into the interior by one of three routes—St. Michael, White Pass R. E. via Skagway, and via Valdez or Cordova over the trail into Fairbanks and other points. Hence, Alaska can be made dry as a bone if Congress so elects.

3. Having no fear that Alaska would go dry on her first vote, the liquor interests shipped into interior Alaska last summer only the usual tonnage of liquors, which supply must last the vast interior territory until the summer of 1917, unless brought in over the trail at a prohibitive cost.

Should the importation of liquors go unchecked next summer, the quantities shipped in will be beyond computation. The liquor interests, through their three wholesale dealers in Alaska, can afford to place as large a stock as they may wish—no limits. The liquor remaining on hand after licenses expire and after January, 1918, will supply material for a profitable bootlegging business for several years to come.

After reading the foregoing we believe you will admit that Alaska needs three things:

1. A prohibition measure which will prohibit the sale and manufacture of liquor in Alaska after January 1, 1918.

2. A clause in the above prohibition measure prohibiting the importation of liquors into Alaska after May 31, 1917. This last and most important clause in order to cut off the bootleggers' supply and settle the bootlegging problem.

3. A sister measure giving Alaska the right to control her schools, bearing in mind that from the Territorial revenues must come the substitute for the liquor license revenues. These two measures must be enacted concurrently by this session of Congress.

In conclusion, will you introduce and support or secure and work for the introduction and passage of the above measures for Alaska? Telegraph rates from Alaska are prohibitive. Alaska too far away for the usual methods of influencing Congress. We are therefore appealing to your sense of fairness and justice in the only manner open to us. Will you aid us and work for us?

Respectfully, yours,

ALINE BRADLEY,  
Legislative Superintendent.

Mr. WADSWORTH presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BRYAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of Florida, praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WEEKS presented a petition of sundry citizens of Shelburne Falls, Mass., praying for national prohibition, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of the Dried Fruit Association of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to

standardize food products, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JOHNSON of Maine presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of South Portland, Me., and a petition of Merrill Rebekah Lodge, No. 84, of Farmington, Me., praying for national prohibition, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. COLT presented resolutions adopted by the Medical Association of Pawtucket, R. I., expressing appreciation for the enactment of legislation providing for the enrollment of physicians in the Officers' Reserve Corps, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Newport, R. I., remonstrating against the deportation of Belgians, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Rhode Island Press Club, remonstrating against any change being made in the present postal rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

#### CIVIL GOVERNMENT FOR PORTO RICO.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I present the following communication which I have received from Mr. Santiago Iglesias, president of the Porto Rico Federation of Labor, and I ask to have it printed in the RECORD. In conjunction with it I have a telegram on the same subject which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR,  
Washington, D. C.

Senator JAMES E. MARTINE.

DEAR SIR: Your attention is respectfully called to an important subject matter which received the consideration of the Thirty-sixth Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor held in Baltimore, Md., November 13-25, 1916.

When, as a result of the Spanish-American War, the United States took possession of Porto Rico in 1898, the promise was made that the inhabitants of Porto Rico would be recognized in all respects as Americans and that citizenship with all its inherent rights and benefits would be fully accorded. Thus far this promise of citizenship has remained unfulfilled. The people of the island are practically without a country they may call their own.

There is now pending before the Senate H. R. 9533, which, if it becomes a law, will grant American citizenship to the people of that island, defining forever the status of the people of Porto Rico. The bill, however, contains several features to which the labor people as well as the people in general of Porto Rico emphatically protest.

For your information I inclose extracts of a letter I have received from Mr. Santiago Iglesias, president of the Free Federation of Workmen of Porto Rico, which are important and self-explanatory.

The recent convention of the American Federation of Labor endorsed the petitions of the workers of Porto Rico that they should not be deprived the civil rights that they now possess and enjoy.

I trust that the above matters may commend themselves to your favorable consideration and action, and request that your support be given to maintaining the rights of the people of Porto Rico.

Very respectfully, yours,

SAML. GOMPERS,  
President American Federation of Labor.

WASHINGTON, D. C., December 4, 1916.

STATEMENT BY SANTIAGO IGLESIAS, PRESIDENT OF PORTO RICO FEDERATION OF LABOR, ON PORTO RICAN BILL.

[This statement in full was handed to President Wilson by President Gompers, of the American Federation of Labor, at the White House, Dec. 4, 1916.]

I now want to make particular reference to the constant failure of Congress during the last few years to enact a law as to the status of the people of Porto Rico. There is now pending before the Senate a bill which, if it becomes law, certainly will define forever the status of the people of Porto Rico. The bill contains several clauses of a reactionary character, against which the Free Federation of Workmen of Porto Rico emphatically protest.

Before entering into the presentation of the features of the bill to which the labor people, as well as the people in general, of Porto Rico protest, let me quote the Hon. JOHN J. SHAFROTH, chairman of the Committee of the Senate on the Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, in an address to the Senate:

"Mr. President, in the formation of our Republic we put forth to the world new principles of government, which seemed so plain to us that we declared them to be self-evident truths. We declared that all men are created equal, not in intellect, not in height, not in strength, not in color, and not in many other respects, but equal in rights. We declared that man is entitled, as an inalienable right, to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. We said in that declaration that so sacred are these rights against tyranny that they not only shall not be invaded by others, but they can not be bartered away even by ourselves."

The working people of Porto Rico wonder why Senator SHAFROTH has not followed the splendid policy he outlined in the framing of the Porto Rican bill.

Section 26 of the Jones bill, with amendments by the Senate committee of which Senator SHAFROTH is chairman, says:

"No person shall be a member of the senate of Porto Rico \* \* \* who does not own \* \* \* taxable property in Porto Rico to the value of no less than \$1,000 \* \* \*"

Section 27 of the same bill says:

"No person shall be a member of the house of representatives \* \* \* who does not own \* \* \* and pay taxes upon property of the assessed value of no less than \$500 \* \* \*"

The only argument which Gov. Yager advanced in advocating the property and the literacy qualifications is that he has proof that the

corporations practically control the votes of large groups of working people.

The labor movement of Porto Rico, as expressed through the Free Federation of Workmen, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, has been and is now the most potential and influential factor in the island to Americanize the people of Porto Rico to the American standard of political action and freedom, and it has succeeded in a great measure in freeing them from the influence of the employers, politically as well as economically. It is a dangerous proposition at this time to impose a property qualification on members to be elected for the senate, as well as for the house of legislature of Porto Rico. To give to only those with property qualification the right to control the affairs of the people of the island will have a tendency to strengthen and encourage the agitation and propaganda of those who are already preaching anti-American sentiments and striving for the independence of the island.

Section 35 of the same bill states "that no person shall be allowed to register as a voter or to vote in Porto Rico unless \* \* \* he is able to read and write or \* \* \* he is a bona fide taxpayer." This has been amended by adding these words: "That all legally qualified electors of Porto Rico at the last election shall be entitled to register and vote at elections for 10 years from and after the passage of this act."

If Congress enacts the bill containing the clause quoted, it will disfranchise three out of every four voters of Porto Rico; the provision will practically disfranchise 175,000 workmen out of a total of 205,000 voters of the whole island. The adoption of that clause would be a great political mistake and a national wrong imposed upon the people of the island.

The people of Porto Rico exercised the franchise for the last 16 years, and even under the Spanish Monarchy. Such rights were accorded to our people by the Cortes of Spain and our local legislature, and now the Congress of the United States is being advised to take away those rights that our people enjoy and possess. It is, indeed, a very serious question that the same bill which purports to grant American citizenship to the people of Porto Rico shall take away the civil rights that our people enjoy and possess, so it will clearly appear to the minds of the people that in being honorably granted citizenship of the United States they are going to lose their civil rights, and a property qualification is to be required for those who make the laws and rule the working people, who constitute ninety-odd per cent of the people of the island.

On the other hand, no means are provided to enable some 300,000 children to attend schools, which amounts to 60 per cent of the total electoral population, who, because of the inability to obtain an education, will be deprived of the right of franchise. Moreover, under the proposed law only such citizens as pay a tax will be privileged to be representatives in the legislature of the island. Workmen, however bright and intelligent they may be, if they pay no taxes, will be disqualified and robbed of the right to be representatives.

Recently Gov. Yager, of Porto Rico, was quoted by the press as saying that it is absolutely necessary that the Jones bill be passed in Congress before the holiday recess in order to check forever the anti-American and independence agitation in the island.

Recently in a conversation with Gen. Frank McIntyre, Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs in the War Department, I tried to convey to him the influences, ideas, and political conditions that now exist in Porto Rico, and he made the following remark, referring specially to that section of the bill relative to the civil rights of Porto Rico: "Those clauses are not essential to the principles of the bill and could very well be eliminated." While the Jones bill grants to the people of Porto Rico American citizenship, that same bill forces upon our people theories of government which have long ago been repudiated by the progressive force of American democracy, as well as the progressive force of Porto Rico.

If the condition of the people of Porto Rico is ever to be raised to a standard at all compatible with that prevailing in the United States, the civil and political rights that we now enjoy and possess must be guaranteed and extended in the new organic law now pending before the Senate.

The Free Federation of Workmen of Porto Rico maintains fully the same declarations and petitions duly made to the President of the United States in Congress year after year.

The people of the island want to solve a great economic problem by the right guaranteed by the new constitution to use the government, whose upholders they are, to obtain loans at a low rate of interest, the government in making such loans to do away with the dreadful usury prevailing through the country. In so doing the government would also hamper and lessen the social and industrial oppression of the masses and help thereby in diffusing the wealth.

The banking system and the credit have both been left in the hands of private manipulation. Both speculation and monopoly, as well as the control of the local government, has fallen into the hands of the most powerful corporations.

The private monopoly of vital interests of the community of the island is detrimental to the well-being of the people, and such monopoly and control of the wealth produced by the people are creating among the popular minds a moral state of indignation against the hateful industrial oppression which has been the cause of so much wretchedness, privation, and hunger among the working masses.

We hope the United States Congress will enact a constitution furthering the common good of all the people of Porto Rico, and in the general interest of the island, relieving the masses of the social and industrial oppression they suffer, oppression which is casting discredit upon the American flag. Congress should suppress the monopoly effected by the corporations, the exportation of the wealth produced by Porto Rican workers should be regulated so as to retain the great part for the benefit of the inhabitants of the island. Now, more than 60 per cent is exported, a circumstance which turns the island into a trading post operated by underfed and barefoot laborers, and in this way the constitution would benefit the whole people, and not a specially privileged class or party. Such a measure would promote the diffusion of wealth and comfort, intelligence, virtue, and equal opportunity, which are the chief aims and aspirations of the wise, democratic American institutions.

NEW YORK, January 16, 1917.

HON. JAMES E. MARTINE,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

We, the undersigned, representing over 2,000 Porto Ricans, workers in several occupations, resident of the city of New York, respectfully indorse the statements of Mr. Santiago Iglesias, labor commissioner of Porto Rico, before the Senate. We certainly believe that if the Jones bill, now pending before the Senate, is passed with the clauses that practically disfranchise three of every four votes of the workers

of Porto Rico and impose a property qualification on members to be elected to the senate as well as for the house of Porto Rico, that will have a tendency to strengthen and encourage the anti-Americanism of those who are discontent and want the independence of the island. This very Jones bill, that purports to grant us American citizenship, is taking away the civil rights that our people enjoy and possess since the Spanish domination there. We have the right to vote and to be elected to the legislature without any property qualifications whatever, and have had it for the last 19 years, and we want the same rights at this time. We also have about 300,000 children without any facilities to attend school, therefore even the future generations are being menaced with the unjust and reactionary clauses of the Jones bill.

P. San Miguel, E. Rosario, M. Domenech, F. Amilibia, F. Hernandez, M. Franquiz, U. T. Roura, O. Omero, T. Martinez, T. Navarro, R. Sanchez, M. Nieves, T. Yera, E. Vargas, M. Roman, T. J. Agillar, B. Nater, S. Parrilla, R. Te Ferrer, T. M. Alvaraz, B. Vega, T. Ocasio, T. Regio, A. Lopez, T. Osarcia, A. Rauleriz, L. Marcia, B. Diaz, T. Cantero, T. M. Rodriguez, T. Otreu, F. Guzman, A. Perez, L. G. Lopez, T. Quinonez, G. Ortiz, G. Rodriguez, R. Rabelo, T. Bernavel, G. Garcia.

#### CHANGE OF NAME OF STEAMERS.

Mr. FLETCHER. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the following bills:

A bill (S. 7779) to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Frank H. Peavey* to *William A. Reiss* (S. Rept. No. 941);

A bill (S. 7780) to authorize change of name of the steamer *Frank T. Heffelfinger* to the *Clemens A. Reiss* (S. Rept. No. 942);

A bill (S. 7781) to authorize the change of name of the steamer *George W. Peavey* to *Richard J. Reiss* (S. Rept. No. 943); and

A bill (S. 7782) to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Frederick B. Wells* to *Otto M. Reiss* (S. Rept. No. 944).

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], who introduced these bills, is not here. I see no objection to action upon the bills, and I prefer a request for unanimous consent that they be acted upon at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GALLINGER. May I ask that the titles be read.

Mr. FLETCHER. The bills change the names of four steamers.

Mr. GALLINGER. It simply changes the names?

Mr. FLETCHER. It simply changes the names. The Department of Commerce does not object.

Mr. GALLINGER. I really can not understand it. There must be a good reason for it. Has not the owner of a steamer the right to change the name?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; he could not. It requires special legislation.

Mr. GALLINGER. Of course, I do not object.

The bill (S. 7779) to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Frank H. Peavey* to *William A. Reiss* was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill (S. 7780) to authorize change of name of the steamer *Frank T. Heffelfinger* to the *Clemens A. Reiss* was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill (S. 7781) to authorize the change of name of the steamer *George W. Peavey* to *Richard J. Reiss* was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The bill (S. 7782) to authorize the change of name of the steamer *Frederick B. Wells* to *Otto M. Reiss* was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred, as follows:

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 7894) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend sections 2275 and 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, providing for the selection of lands for educational purposes in lieu of those appropriated," and to authorize an exchange of lands between the United States and the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. THOMPSON:

A bill (S. 7895) for the relief of Winona May Devers and Emma McElvaine; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 7896) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Holmes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEEKS:

A bill (S. 7897) granting a pension to Phillip H. Vose (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 7898) to provide for the erection of a public building at Newport, Tenn.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 7899) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Loftis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 7900) granting an increase of pension to George F. Thayer (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 7901) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Alway (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Maine:

A bill (S. 7902) granting an increase of pension to James S. Moore (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 7903) granting an increase of pension to Michael Burns (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 7904) granting an increase of pension to George E. Cross (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEWIS:

A bill (S. 7905) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury, in his discretion, to transfer and convey to the commissioners of Lincoln Park, of Chicago, Ill., the riparian rights of the United States, as the owner of land fronting on Lake Michigan and occupied as the site of the United States marine hospital in Chicago, Ill.; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 7906) to authorize the President of the United States, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint George L. Morrison captain of Cavalry, to take rank as such next after Capt. James A. Mars (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 7907) to create a new division of the northern judicial district of Texas, and to provide for terms of court at Lubbock, Tex., and for a clerk for said court, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POINDEXTER:

A bill (S. 7908) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Mullen (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

#### AMENDMENT TO NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CURTIS submitted an amendment providing that the creditable Civil War service of survivors still in the Navy shall be accounted as having been equivalent to incident of service wherever requisite, but without change of any present pay, intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed.

#### EDUCATION OF IMMIGRANTS.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the sundry civil appropriation bill, making an appropriation in aid of the education of immigrants to the United States in the public schools of the States, to be expended under the Naturalization Bureau of the Labor Department. I ask to have the amendment printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

#### APPOINTMENT OF DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. WORKS. I submit a resolution, which I send to the desk and ask for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from California will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 320), as follows:

Whereas it is understood that certain persons have been appointed or designated to represent the Government or the President of the United States in foreign countries, and to negotiate with such Governments and report to and advise with the officials of this Government as to conditions in other countries, and to perform the duties of diplomatic officials, or to perform other duties, without being nominated or confirmed by the Senate; and

Whereas the standing of such persons and their authority to act as such diplomatic representatives, or otherwise, is in doubt: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State is hereby directed to report to the Senate:

1. What, if any, persons have been appointed or designated, without confirmation by the Senate, to represent the Government or the President in any other country.

2. The nature of their appointments and by whom made, the services required of them, to what countries they were appointed and for what term, how long they have served, their names, where located, what was the designation of their offices, respectively, and the salary paid to each of them, respectively, and who of them are still in service under such appointments or designations without being confirmed by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from California asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which has just been read.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I object. I should like to suggest that the resolution embraces a matter which evidently ought to go to the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, it is only a resolution inquiring for information, and I see no good reason why it should not be adopted by the Senate, as is usual in cases of that kind.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then I will let the resolution go over until to-morrow, so that we may have an opportunity to examine it.

Mr. WORKS. Of course, if the Senator desires it, I have no wish to prevent the consideration of the resolution by the Committee on Foreign Relations. We are now just about to resume relations with somebody in Mexico; hardly the government of Mexico, because I think there is no government down there. If we are to take up our diplomatic relations in the regular way, I think it is a good time to inquire about who is to represent us down there now. That is the only object of the resolution—to get information on the subject.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I prefer to have the resolution go to the committee; but if the Senator desires to have the resolution go over until to-morrow he has that right.

Mr. WORKS. I have no desire to have the resolution go over until to-morrow for the purpose of discussing it, for I have no such intention. The resolution is not offered with that object in view at all. It is simply offered for the purpose of obtaining the information that is asked for. If, however, the Senator from Nebraska insists upon the resolution going to the committee, I shall not object.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask that the resolution go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### REPORT OF NAVY-YARD COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO. 1946).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith, as required by the provisions of the act of Congress making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, the first preliminary report of the Navy Yard Commission, the appointment of which was authorized by said act.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 17, 1917.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 19410. An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

#### LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there are no further concurrent or other resolutions, the morning business is closed.

Mr. OVERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the legislative, and so forth, appropriation bill.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, on Monday last there was some sort of an understanding that to-day we should proceed, at the close of the routine morning business, with the calendar. I do not want to interfere with the consideration of this important appropriation bill, but I desire to repeat what I said on Monday. There are a great many Senate bills upon the calendar as to which, if they are not considered here very soon, there will be no chance at all of getting them to the other House, so that they can be considered there and passed at this session. All that is necessary as to many of these bills is merely to have them come up, for there is no objection to them; some of them are private bills, and I think Members of the Senate have a right to insist

upon some time being given for the consideration of these bills on the calendar. The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] on Monday stated that he would endeavor to have an arrangement made with Senators on the other side of the Chamber, so that the calendar would be taken up to-day. I should like to ask what has become of that assurance?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, if the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] will permit me, the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] evidently refers to a colloquy on the floor of the Senate between himself and me. I then supposed that the Senate would now be devoting most of its time to the consideration of the water-power bill, the unfinished business. The appropriation bill, however, as the Senator knows, has taken up most of the intervening time. I trust that we shall get that bill out of the way as speedily as possible. I continue to feel, as I did on Monday, that the request made by the Senator from Pennsylvania is a very reasonable one; and I assure him that I shall make every effort to get an agreement upon this side to take up by unanimous consent the calendar at the very earliest convenient moment.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I realize that it is important that the appropriation bills should be considered as soon as possible, and I would not want to stand in the way of the consideration of the legislative appropriation bill at this time even if I could do so; but I sincerely hope that there will be some sort of management upon the other side of the Chamber, and that the routine business of the Senate on the calendar may be disposed of at an early date.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 18542) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The first committee amendment passed over will be stated.

The SECRETARY. The first committee amendment passed over is, on page 41, beginning in line 18, where the Committee on Appropriations report to strike out the following clause:

Federal Farm Loan Bureau: For salaries and expenses under the Federal Farm Loan Board created by the act approved July 17, 1916, including the salaries of four members at the rate of \$10,000 each per annum, and their actual necessary traveling expenses and such salaries, fees, and expenses as are authorized by said act, including farm-loan registrars, examiners, and such attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, laborers, and other employees as the Farm Loan Board may find necessary, \$300,000. A detailed statement of expenditures hereunder shall be made to Congress.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Federal Farm Loan Bureau: For 4 members of the board, at \$7,500 each; chief, bond division, \$3,000; secretary to the board, \$3,000; publicity agent, \$2,000; 4 private secretaries, at \$1,800 each; clerks—1 of class 4, 1 \$900, 3 at \$720 each, 1 \$600; clerk and stenographer, \$1,200; stenographers—7 at \$1,000 each, 4 at \$900 each, 3 at \$720 each; messenger; and 3 assistant messengers; in all, \$67,620.

For salaries and expenses under the Federal Farm Loan Board created by the act approved July 17, 1916, including the actual necessary traveling expenses of the members of the board and such salaries, fees, and expenses as are authorized by said act, including farm-loan registrars, examiners, and such attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, laborers, and other employees as the Farm Loan Board may find necessary, \$182,880; in all, \$250,000. A detailed statement of expenditures hereunder shall be made to Congress.

Estimates in detail for all expenditures under the Federal Farm Loan Bureau for the fiscal year 1919, and annually thereafter, shall be submitted to Congress in the annual Book of Estimates.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, when this amendment was brought up yesterday I asked to have it go over until to-day. I made the point of order that it was contrary to existing law, and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] made the point of order that it was general legislation. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry before I address myself to the point of order. I understand that this is a motion to strike out and insert, and therefore that the whole proposition to insert must be considered together and can not be divided. I inquire if that is a proper understanding?

Mr. OVERMAN. What is the point? I did not understand the Senator.

Mr. HOLLIS. The proposition is to strike out and insert; and I understand that the proposed amendment therefore can not be divided, but that it must all stand or fall together.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; Mr. President, it is just the reverse of that. Under the rule a substitute can be perfected, and Rule XIX, I think, provides that wherever a substitute is offered it can be perfected at any time.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, that was not the proposition. There is no new amendment proposed, as I understand, and as the matter stands now it is a plain proposition to strike out a

paragraph and insert in lieu thereof three paragraphs. I ask for a ruling on that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. HOLLIS. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Of course the Senator does not in any sense mean that an amendment can not be made to the matter submitted by the committee?

Mr. HOLLIS. Certainly not; but no amendment has been offered as yet.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Naturally there will be amendments offered before we get through.

Mr. HOLLIS. There may be; I am not informed as to that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It will be subject to amendment and correction before we are finally compelled to vote upon the motion to substitute.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, in that connection I desire to say that there is one provision in the Senate committee amendment that is clearly subject to a point of order, because it changes existing law, and that provision has reference to the salaries of the four members of the Farm Loan Board. I frankly state that, in my opinion, the point of order will lie, unless their salary is raised in the amendment from \$7,500 to \$10,000. I wish to say to the Senator that, so far as I am concerned, if the Senator having the bill in charge does not offer an amendment changing the amount from \$7,500 to \$10,000, I shall do so myself; but I understand the Senator from North Carolina is perfectly willing to do that in order to obviate the point of order made by the Senator, but for no other reason.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I understand this is an amendment offered by the Committee on Appropriations. If the Committee on Appropriations changes the amendment, then we will have that amendment to consider; but until the Committee on Appropriations does change the amendment I understand we are now obliged to consider the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator having made the point of order, I will propose an amendment if the Senator will yield to me. I want to say, Mr. President, that I voted against this reduction because I thought it subject to a point of order. The committee thought they would bring to the attention of the Senate this particular item in the amendment, and whether any Senator would make a point of order upon it we did not know. I now move to amend the amendment by striking out "at \$7,500 each" and inserting in lieu thereof "at \$10,000 each," and then correcting the total.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I should like, first, a ruling on the point of order I have raised. I would rather proceed under the rules of the Senate, and I should like an answer as to whether the amendment can be divided.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that this is the text of the bill as it came from the House:

Federal Farm Loan Bureau: For salaries and expenses under the Federal Farm Loan Board created by the act approved July 17, 1916, including the salaries of four members at the rate of \$10,000 each per annum—

And so forth.

The Chair also understands that \$10,000 per annum is the salary that is fixed in the law creating the Federal Farm Loan Board. The Senate committee offers to amend by striking out that language and inserting "Federal Farm Loan Bureau: For four members of the board, at \$7,500 each," with other additional clauses.

The rules of the Senate are that where there is a motion to strike out and to insert, each may be separately amended and perfected before a final vote upon the motion to strike out and to insert, and that in such amendments the portion to be stricken out has precedence in the matter of amendment; but the Chair believes that when a point of order is raised it is the duty of the Chair to decide, or to have the Senate decide, the point of order, unless withdrawn. The Chair does not believe that when a point of order is raised to an amendment the amendment is divisible at all; but the point of order must be either sustained or overruled. Of course, if sustained, there is no reason why another amendment may not be immediately presented avoiding the point of order. That is the ruling of the Chair. Unless the point of order is withdrawn, it must be ruled on.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me for a moment?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desire to make this suggestion: This amendment or substitute does not change the law fixing the salary of the Farm Loan Board at \$10,000 each. It leaves that the law. It simply neglects to appropriate to them what their salary is as fixed by law, but it would leave the United

States liable to them for the balance of the salary. It is not a change of existing law. The statute fixes their salary. This is a failure to appropriate the money fixed by the statute as their salary, and does not change the statute, or pretend to change the statute; and I am very much gratified to know that the committee recognize the fact that the salary will continue to be \$10,000, and are ready to appropriate for the salary fixed by law.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the distinguished Senator whether he believes that it is good policy for the Senate of the United States to leave a statute fixing a salary at \$10,000 a year, and then, in the face of that statute, neglect to appropriate the full amount?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have just said that, although I would vote under a general bill introduced to change the law and fix the salary at \$7,500, while the law leaves the salary at \$10,000 I would not vote for an appropriation bill that undertook to appropriate less than the general statute fixed as the salary.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will.

Mr. HOLLIS. I desire to ask the Senator whether he has examined the books and come to a decision or opinion that the balance of the salary would be due?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think that it has been held that it was due, and collections have been made through the Court of Claims for salaries fixed by law when not appropriated for.

Mr. HOLLIS. I looked the matter up yesterday, and I found the authorities were the other way; but there may be some later authorities that I did not perceive.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if my colleague will permit me the suggestion, I have in mind one case—I will not recite it because it occurred several years ago—where portion of a salary was withheld for several years and the officer never recovered the balance. I know that to be the fact.

Mr. HOLLIS. That was the case of a United States judge in Wyoming, I think. I looked the case up yesterday. That is true.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think there have been cases before the Court of Claims in which the salaries not appropriated were subsequently collected. I have made no recent investigation of the subject.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the Senator allow me to suggest that whatever may be said upon that subject the whole amendment as offered is subject to the objection of being general legislation on an appropriation bill?

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, if my colleague will permit me, the case I allude to was one in which I took a great deal of interest, and protested against the reduction year after year for several years, but it was continued, and that official died without ever receiving the balance of his salary, which was manifestly his due.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire another question. Is it not a fact also that the Federal farm-loan act provided that the Federal Farm Loan Board should fix the salaries of its employees; and does not the amendment now offered by the committee propose to fix those salaries which are subject to be fixed only by the Farm Loan Board?

Mr. HOLLIS. That is absolutely accurate.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is a change of existing law.

Mr. HOLLIS. We will reach that in the course of the unwinding process, and I shall have something to say about that when it is reached.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is, then, an attempt to change existing law by this amendment.

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes; it is, and I shall have a good deal to say about it at the proper time. At the present time I understand that this amendment offered by the committee is out of order. When somebody offers another amendment to change the bill as it came from the House I shall have something to say about that; but I understand that this will dispose of the committee amendment. Then, some one will have to bring it to life again.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire or the Senator from Georgia to point out any rule of the Senate which prohibits an amendment which would change existing law, as that seems to be the basis of the objection. I know of no such rule; and if there is a rule of that character, I should like to have it pointed out.

Mr. HOLLIS. I shall be very glad to address myself to that. The distinguished Senator will find in the Precedents of the Senate, on page 128, two cases where that was given as a

reason, that the amendment proposed changed existing law; but it is very true that that provision, referring to a change in existing law, is not found in the rules of the Senate. There is, however, found in the rules of the Senate a provision that general legislation may not be proposed to a general appropriation bill; and a change of existing law would be obviously general legislation, and therefore it comes under the rule.

Mr. McCUMBER. Not necessarily, by any means, Mr. President.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Chair to the ruling on yesterday, and to the fact that if these rulings continue in this way the Committee on Appropriations need not have any bill referred to it at all. All this bill deals with is salaries, either reductions or increases; and if the rulings go on as they did yesterday we might as well pass the bill exactly as it comes from the House, because everything the Senate does, either a reduction or an increase of salary, is changing existing law.

The present occupant of the chair will have that question presented to him again, and it will be seen whether his ruling will be along the same line. So I say that if the rulings go on as they have, and anything this committee does in the way of changing or reducing salaries is ruled out on the ground of being a change of existing law, this being a bill for salaries, why send any bill to the committee? The committee will have nothing to do but to accept the House bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I do not think I can agree with the Senator from North Carolina with reference to that. This is an entirely different proposition from the one we had before us yesterday. Yesterday we had before us a proposition to create an office, and then provide a method of filling it, and then provide a salary. So I do not think this is a question like that at all.

I can not agree with the Senator from Utah that this amendment changes existing law, or that it changes the salary heretofore fixed. It does not even pretend to do that. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] pointed out very clearly that all that this amendment proposes to do is simply to appropriate \$7,500 instead of \$10,000 a year. That is all there is to it. These gentlemen may have a legal claim against the Government for the additional amount. They will never get it unless we appropriate it, however. My recollection is that the law provides that the surveyors general of many of the different Western States shall receive a certain salary, and yet for many years Congress has refused to appropriate that amount. We have appropriated what we thought the salary ought to be. Those gentlemen have not collected the difference from the Government. They might get a judgment in the Court of Claims, but that does not pay itself.

I can not agree with the suggestion of the Senator from Utah that this amendment changes existing law. It does not change existing law. It does not pretend to change existing law.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator pardon me a moment? A change of an existing law can be made on an appropriation bill. It is only general legislation that can not be added to an appropriation bill.

Mr. JONES. Well, I take it that the change in existing law might be general legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It might or it might not.

Mr. JONES. Yes, I know; but the mere fact—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. There can be a change of existing law without its amounting to general legislation.

Mr. JONES. Well, Mr. President, if this amendment goes so far as to change the salaries of these officers, then I take it that it is general legislation; but I do not think it goes that far at all. It does not pretend to change the salaries. It simply refuses to appropriate \$10,000 this year; that is all.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, suppose we refused to make any appropriation at all. Could we do that, if we wanted to?

Mr. JONES. Why, certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. That does not change an existing law. Suppose Congress says, "We will not make any appropriation for this office at all." That is often done.

Mr. JONES. Why, certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. If we can do that, why can we not diminish the amount?

Mr. JONES. We can, in my judgment.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not see why we can not.

Mr. JONES. It is not a question of being in order or otherwise. It is simply a question as to whether we will appropriate this amount of money, or appropriate the amount that the law provides for their salaries.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, my friend the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], in charge of the bill, in speak-

ing to the point raised by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] stated that there were decisions made yesterday in such a way that if it went on the committees of the Senate would be unable to transact any business. I want to call his attention to this fact, which I think is correct—that there were not decisions made yesterday, as I understand, to which he objects. So far as I know, there was only one decision made by the Chair yesterday in regard to a Senate amendment which was opposed to the views of the Senator from North Carolina. That decision was made while the President pro tempore was out of the Chamber, and was, I think, overwhelmingly sustained by the Senate itself.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is true.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I want to call his attention to the fact that the statement that there were decisions made by the Senate is incorrect, and I also think it just to call attention to the fact that the decision of the temporary occupant of the chair was overwhelmingly sustained by the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is true. I simply say that if that decision and this decision on the point made by the Senator from New Hampshire—the two decisions—are carried out, the result will be that I do not see what we will have to do in an appropriation bill. The Senator from Delaware was not in the chair at all, and the Senate sustained the occupant of the chair. That is true.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I thought it was only fair to the occupant of the chair at that time that attention should be called to the fact.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is true.

Mr. WORKS. Mr. President, I quite agree with the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] that the proposed amendment would not have the effect of repealing an existing statute. It is rather an attempt on the part of Congress to repudiate a statutory obligation. That is precisely what it amounts to.

I am satisfied myself that the salaries fixed for these officials are unreasonably high. If there were an opportunity to vote upon it, I should vote to reduce those salaries; but I do not believe in this means of repudiating an honest debt of the Government. That is precisely what it amounts to.

Mr. HOLLIS. I desire to say further, Mr. President, on the point that it is general legislation, that the third paragraph, providing how estimates shall be made hereafter, both for the year 1919 and every other year that may come forever, is general legislation, and that that also would be sufficient to rule the amendment out of order.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, the question which was before the Senate yesterday was an altogether different one from that which is presented now. The question there was whether or not the creation of an office by an act of Congress was general legislation, and the Chair very properly held that it was. There are numberless precedents to sustain that decision of the Chair. But a provision in an appropriation bill by which the salary of an officer is changed for a single fiscal year, it seems to me, is clearly not general legislation. That has been ruled upon; and I have one case before me now, in the first volume of the Precedents, at page 78, where the District of Columbia appropriation bill was pending, and an amendment was offered to provide for two commissioners at \$6,000 each, instead of the amount fixed by law, which, I think, was \$5,000 each. The point of order was made that it was general legislation, and after some colloquy upon the matter the Vice President [Mr. Sherman] said:

The Chair thinks that if it were general legislation the Senator's contention would be correct, but the Chair thinks it is not general legislation to change the amount of a salary for a fiscal year. It does not change the law, but it changes the salary for this fiscal year, and on that ground the Chair overrules the point of order.

The Chair then proceeds at some length to discuss the question.

So it seems to me that all this proposed amendment seeks to do is to change the salary for the ensuing fiscal year from \$10,000 to \$7,500. It carves that exception out of the general law for that limited period of time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Will the Senator from Utah permit an interruption from the Chair in order that we may get the facts?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand that the farm-loan law provides that the Farm Loan Board shall appoint the various officers therein provided for and fix their salaries?

Mr. HOLLIS. It does. I shall be glad to read that law to the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair desires the opinion of the Senator from Utah on that branch of the amendment.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have given that branch of the amendment no thought. I am simply directing my suggestions to the one item. I think, however, speaking without much reflection, that there is a distinction between the two things.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah speak a little louder? I am anxious to hear the Senator from Utah, and I can not.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I say I think the particular amendment which appropriates \$7,500 to each of the members of the Farm Loan Board, instead of \$10,000, the amount fixed by law, simply has the effect of carving out of the general law an exception for this particular fiscal year and allowing them \$7,500 for this year without repealing the general provisions of the law. I think that is special, as distinguished from general legislation.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, let me call the Senator's attention to the provisions of the act. In the first place, the farm-loan law provides that the salaries of the members of the board shall be \$10,000 per annum. Then it provides:

The Federal Farm Loan Board shall be authorized and empowered to employ such attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, laborers, and other employees as it may deem necessary to conduct the business of said board.

The law says, further:

All salaries and fees authorized in this section and not otherwise provided for shall be fixed in advance by said board and shall be paid in the same manner as the salaries of the Federal Farm Loan Board.

That is the law. The amendment proposes that the members of the board shall be paid \$7,500 each, which the Senator says will not be general legislation, because they will have a right to do that, perhaps; but the general legislation certainly is found in the provision in this amendment that there shall be a chief of the Bond Division, whose salary shall be \$3,000. The law says that all salaries shall be fixed by the board and shall be paid in the same way as the salaries of the members of the board, and there is not in the law anywhere any provision for such an officer as the chief of the Bond Division.

Then this amendment says that there shall be a secretary to the board, at \$3,000. The law says that the board shall fix all salaries and shall employ all agents and assistants. There is not any provision in the law for a secretary, as far as that is concerned.

The amendment says there shall be a publicity agent, at \$2,000. The law says the board shall fix the salaries of all agents and shall employ all of these people.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I have not been able to hear all that the Senator from Florida has said; but let me ask him if there is a provision in the law that the Farm Loan Board shall fix the salaries?

Mr. FLETCHER. Absolutely.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. The Senator did not read it, then, or else I did not catch it.

Mr. FLETCHER. I read it, but the Senator did not hear it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will read it again:

The Federal Farm Loan Board shall be authorized and empowered to employ such attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, laborers, and other employees as it may deem necessary to conduct the business of said board. All salaries and fees authorized in this section and not otherwise provided for shall be fixed in advance—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Will not the Senator read that part about the salaries again?

Mr. FLETCHER (reading)—

All salaries and fees authorized in this section and not otherwise provided for shall be fixed in advance by said board, and shall be paid in the same manner as the salaries of the Federal Farm Loan Board.

That is the law—"shall be fixed in advance by said board." You now propose in this bill to specify what employees this board shall engage, and designate them as publicity agent and secretary and superintendent of bond issues, and fix their compensation in this bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, that is the way the board themselves have fixed them. We have given the language of the Farm Loan Board.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, I am sure—

Mr. FLETCHER. I am simply raising the point that the whole amendment is subject to the objection that it is general legislation. If the board fix these salaries themselves, it is up to them to fix them. It is not for us to legislate upon the subject. This is general legislation, undoubtedly, in those respects.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me right there to elicit some information along the lines he has suggested?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator's contention is that that board have a right to fix the salaries at any sum they please, and Congress has nothing in the world to do with it. Now, the first example here is that the Farm Loan Board have fixed the salary of their secretary at \$6,000—more than the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury gets.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. As much as a district judge of the United States gets.

Mr. OVERMAN. As much as a district judge of the United States gets. The question I want to bring to the Senator's attention is this: Has not Congress the right to fix a salary, and, when it makes its appropriation, to say what that salary shall be? If the board fix the salary in advance, it is for Congress to say whether they will appropriate the money out of the lump sum for the payment of salaries. For example, they fix the salary of the bond-division man at \$3,900, and they give their secretary as much money as the judges of the United States court get.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think, Mr. President, that the proposed amendment, and I have read it over carefully during the colloquy, does not seek to change existing law. No part of it seeks to do that. It simply makes appropriations for the coming fiscal year.

The question might arise as to whether or not, under the farm-loan act, the action of the board in fixing the salaries was binding upon the Government, but that is not the question presented here. We are simply appropriating for the next fiscal year, and I think that no part of this proposed amendment is open to the objection that it is general legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. While the Senator is on the floor I wish to call his attention to and ask that he express himself upon the difference between changing general legislation and changing an existing law. An existing law might not amount to general legislation. I now call your attention to a definition contained in our work on precedents:

General legislation—that is, legislation which is applicable throughout the States generally as distinguished from special legislation—

And so forth.

What I want to ask the Senator to consider, because I have great confidence in his capacity to give a correct construction, is the difference between a rule limiting our right to put upon an appropriation bill general legislation and our right on an appropriation bill to change an existing law which does not amount to general legislation.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Just one word further.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In all the bills that we first pass creating a bureau we do not know just what they will need, and we give them a lump sum and let the new organization distribute it. As soon as we have had time to find out what they need we then in the appropriation bill specify the amount we allow them to use for each one of the particular branches of work or for each of the employees whom they have selected. That has been done for the five years since I have been here, and I have never before heard it suggested that it was general legislation. I am agreeing entirely with the Senator in his conclusion, and I thought the Senator might perhaps make it even a little broader than he has made it.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I agree with what the Senator from Georgia has said, because the two things may be utterly different—general legislation and a proposition to change existing law. The rule in the House is that an amendment can not be received which changes existing law. The rule in the Senate is that an amendment will not be received which amounts to general legislation. If we were to provide here, instead of the language appropriating for four members of the board at \$7,500 each, a provision that "hereafter" each member of the Farm Loan Board should receive \$7,500, that would be general legislation; but to simply make an appropriation of \$7,500 for the fiscal year, which is all that the appropriation bill seeks to do, is not general legislation.

It seems to me, also, that neither is any other part of the amendment, which proposes to give to the chief of the bond division \$3,000, general legislation. That is limited to the fiscal year, and it does not fix the salary for the future. So far as the Farm Loan Board is concerned, the effect of it is simply to carve out from the operation of the general law an exception so that for the coming year they shall receive \$7,500.

Mr. WATSON. I should like to ask the Senator from Utah a question. Is it or is it not a change of existing law, modifying the power of the board as fixed by the law creating it?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. It may be a change in existing law, but it is not general legislation. Let us take a very simple illustration. At the last session we passed an act granting a pension to some particular individual. That is clearly private legislation; it is not general legislation. If we were to undertake to change that particular law so as to cut down the amount of that pension it would be a change of existing law, but it would not be general legislation.

Mr. WATSON. Does or does not the Senator believe that in legislation of this character we should take notice of the House rule?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Oh, no.

Mr. WATSON. You do not do that?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. We have nothing to do with the House rule.

Mr. WATSON. Not being familiar with the custom here, I was not aware of the procedure, the rule there being that there should be no legislation on an appropriation bill. In my judgment, it is legislation when you change the power of the board from that which was conferred on the board by the organic law creating it, and that is precisely what this does; and yet it might not be inimical or hostile to the rule of the Senate, because I concede it is not general legislation.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. SUTHERLAND. If the Senator will pardon me a moment, it does not even change the power of the board. It simply makes an appropriation of \$3,000 for the Chief of the Bond Division for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. BRYAN. I suggest to the Senator from Utah if he will notice the second paragraph of the committee amendment, he will see that there was no attempt to limit the power granted to the board by the act creating it. The language read by my colleague from the act authorizes the board to fix salaries, fees, and expenses. So paragraph 2 of the Senate committee amendment provides "for salaries and expenses under the Federal Farm Loan Board created by the act"—giving the date—"including the actual necessary traveling expenses of the members of the board and such salaries, fees, and expenses as are authorized by said act, including farm-loan registrars, examiners, and such attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, laborers, and other employees," and so forth.

The committee did not undertake to change the provision of the act at all. What the committee did was to fix the salary of the employees they already have for the ensuing year, the salaries enumerated in the first paragraph of the amendment. If the Senate has not a right to lower a salary fixed by the Farm Loan Board or to raise the salary of an employee of that board, then we have very little right, and the rule of the Senate is used to take away any power at all to control the amount that should be paid to clerks, secretaries, and so on. I have never thought that the provision inhibiting the Senate from making general legislation upon an appropriation bill could be given so narrow a construction as is contended for.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Utah a question. Could the right of Congress to make appropriations be limited by any rule of the Senate? Is not the authority of Congress to appropriate for any purpose, its right to determine what it will appropriate for this purpose and that purpose, a constitutional right which could not be taken away by any rule which the Senate could possibly adopt?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think it would be correct to say that the power of Congress to make an appropriation could not be taken away by any rule of the Senate. That is obvious; but the Senate could by rule limit the way in which it shall legislate, the way in which it shall make appropriations.

Mr. McCUMBER. But not the amount which it can appropriate for any particular purpose.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think not. I have said all I care to say about the matter.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator a question. I am interested in his definition of general legislation. I should like to ask him if an amendment should be offered here that the act known as the farm-loan bank act is hereby repealed, would it be general legislation?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I have no doubt it would be.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then does the Senator argue that a provision which would nullify a part of that act is not general legislation?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. Mr. President, I have evidently been unhappy in stating my position. I have already said that if this provision was that "hereafter" the salaries of the members of the Farm Loan Board shall be \$7,500, that would be general legislation. But this proposed amendment does not do that. It does not change the law at all.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Let me ask the Senator another question. Mr. SUTHERLAND. The effect of it simply is to make an appropriation of \$7,500 for each of the members of the Farm Loan Board for the coming fiscal year, leaving the law to stand as it is.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Suppose an amendment were offered here that the Federal farm-loan act is hereby suspended for one year, would that be general legislation?

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I think that would be general legislation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator now proposes to suspend for one year one of the provisions of the Federal farm-loan act.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; we do not suspend it at all.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It does in effect.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. No; we make an appropriation of \$7,500 for each of the members of the Farm Loan Board. The question may arise hereafter, as suggested by the Senator from Georgia, as to whether, notwithstanding this appropriation of \$7,500, there may not in some way be some sort of an action to recover the remaining \$2,500. That is a matter to be determined hereafter, about which I express no opinion; but I do insist that, so far as this proposed amendment is concerned, it does no more than to make an appropriation of \$7,500 for each member of the Farm Loan Board for the fiscal year 1917-18; it does not attempt to change the existing law, and it is not general legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there has never been created in any of the departments of the Government a division or a bureau that was not created almost in the exact language of the act creating the Federal Farm Loan Board. The employees in those divisions or bureaus for the first year have been paid from a lump sum the salaries fixed by the superintendent or head of the division or bureau, and following the first year the House of Representatives have always requested the head of the bureau or division to itemize the principal officers and the classes of clerks that they require in the division or bureau; and there never has been a question raised in the Senate of the United States that it was general legislation.

Now, I want to tell the Senate why the Committee on Appropriations made this change at this time, because this is the first year we have appropriated since the board has been organized in this specific way. We asked the members of the board to submit to the committee their present monthly pay roll. We did that, Mr. President, to find out how the salaries paid out of that lump sum compare with the salaries that are being paid by the other departments of our Government. This is what we found, and I want to say I hold in my hand the report which was made by two of the members of the board, and they appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate:

FEDERAL FARM LOAN BUREAU,  
TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1917.

Present monthly pay roll of the Federal Farm Loan Board:

Members: Salary, \$10,000 per annum; total, \$40,000.

Secretary to board: Salary, \$6,000 per annum.

Publicity agent: Salary, \$3,900 per annum.  
Chief Bond Division: Salary, \$3,600 per annum.

Private secretary's salary, \$2,500; there being four of them, \$10,000. Clerks of class 4 and other clerks are, of course, paid the same as the law provides, and I shall not take the time of the Senate to show how many they have of the different classes of clerks.

Stenographers, \$1,200—and they give the names of the stenographers drawing \$1,200. Then, there are two stenographers they have—clerks, they call them—at \$720. They are paying the messengers \$900. Every other department is paying \$840.

Now, let me call the attention of the Senate to some of the salaries that are paid for similar work in other departments. Here is the secretary of the board, at \$6,000. Senators, do you know that that is \$1,000 more than we appropriate for the Commissioner of the Land Office, for the Commissioner of Pensions, for the heads of all the bureaus of our departments? One thousand dollars more is paid to the secretary of the board than is paid to the heads of these great divisions of our Government.

Mr. WARREN. To the Assistant Secretary of State or Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SMOOT. I am coming to that. The Assistant Secretary of State does not get as much as the secretary of this little board which has never done one dollar's worth of business up to the present time.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if the secretary is a man of special attainment or special

training along such lines, and if that has anything to do with his salary?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether it is proper for me to speak of that. I could answer the Senator by giving the information that was given to the committee by two members of the board, but I do not think that is proper to do. However, I will say to the Senator that it is not the case.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It might perhaps help the Chair to rule on the point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing if the Chair desires to rule on it, but I was going simply to call attention to the other reasons why the change was made and also why we have always followed the course that has been followed in the past, and no question was ever raised before.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is ready to rule. The Chair does not know what he ruled before. He is going to rule now upon it and the ruling is based upon these views.

The Chair does not agree with the discussion that has been going on as to what constitutes general legislation. It is not as broad as the definitions have gone. It is not necessary to have a law applied to everybody in the United States in order to be general legislation.

But the Chair does not think that the question of salary is general legislation. Whatever the definition of general legislation may be, however broad or however constricted it may be, the rule of the Senate, it seems to the Chair, with reference to changes was based upon the idea that rights had been acquired under the legislation that could not be summarily changed in an appropriation bill.

No man, as the Chair understands it, is entitled to a fixed salary. The Chair does not agree with the Senator from Georgia that you are just making an appropriation here of a part of a salary and that at some time you may come along and pay the rest of it if you want to do it. The salary is nothing but the salt money that is paid to all of us when we earn our salt, and the Chair thinks that in an appropriation bill it is perfectly legitimate for the Congress of the United States to either increase or decrease the salary of an official. He has no vested interest in his salary. He has a vested interest in his office until lawfully removed therefrom.

The Chair does not want this ruling to go out with the opinion of the Chair that, if the salary be decreased to \$7,500, the members of the Farm Loan Board will have a \$2,500 claim against the Government of the United States. The Chair does not think so. When a man takes an office he is subject to the legislative will with reference to his salary.

The Chair would have been inclined to sustain the point of order made by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS], with reference to salaries and expenses, had it not been for the fact that the amendment seems to still give the Farm Loan Board the identical right which it has under the statute, and that the only salary which this amendment is decreasing, as it seems from the discussion, is that of certain officials of the Farm Loan Board now holding office. The Chair would have sustained the point of order had not the amendment contained exactly the language of the bill, because the Chair believes that it would have been general legislation for the Congress of the United States to summarily take away from the Farm Loan Board their general power, which in the statute is conferred upon them. If it had been confined to that, the Chair would have sustained the point of order; but as the statute seems to be contained in the amendment the point of order is overruled.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, from the decision of the Chair I wish to appeal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the ruling of the Senate?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it does not seem to me that the fact that that language is contained in the general law giving to this board the right and the power to fix various salaries has anything to do with the point at issue; in other words, it does not make this general legislation. I do not believe it is legislation, and I do not believe it even goes far enough to change existing law. If these salaries had been fixed by Congress, as Congress might have done and may yet do, it still would be proper in an appropriation bill, if Congress saw fit to do so, to appropriate one-half of the salary, and the fact that it is proposed to appropriate all of the salary would not make the provision subject to a point of order. A motion to amend it and to increase the salary is in order and is proper, and is one of the motions that can be made; but if Congress failed to appropriate at all for some particular officer, it would not put the amendment in such a position that it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nebraska will permit me, along the line he is speaking—

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. For many years in the Territories the law provided certain sums for the payment of the governors and certain sums for the salaries of the judges. They were cut down from \$500 to \$1,000 a piece. Suits were afterwards brought by those governors and judges who received the reduced salaries in one or two cases for the balance they claimed to be due, but those suits failed.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. The fact that we do not appropriate in a bill the entire sum that is due under the law to an officeholder does not make such a provision subject to a point of order, because it does not change existing law, even though that were the rule here.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. GALLINGER. If the Senator will permit me, I wish to say that we had some years ago a national board of health. The salaries were pretty liberal. They used up a large amount of money, and finally Congress, in its discretion, absolutely refused to make any appropriation, and the board went out of existence.

Mr. NORRIS. And Congress had a perfect legal right to so refuse. As to whether they would have a claim against the Government has nothing to do with the question as to whether it is in order here as a parliamentary proposition. They may have had such a claim or they may not have had.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator this question—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FLETCHER. Suppose the law provided that this board was authorized to employ a secretary, that it specified the duties of the secretary and fixed his salary, and that then in a general appropriation bill the proposition was made to fix the salary of that officer at \$1 per annum, does the Senator think that that would be general legislation in effect?

Mr. NORRIS. I will say to the Senator that if that were put in a bill as a proposition of law—that is, if you provided in the bill that the salary of this particular official should be \$1 per annum—that would be legislation. That is an entirely different proposition from appropriating to pay a salary. Congress can appropriate anything in an appropriation bill so long as it does not go above the salary fixed by law, and it is not subject to a point of order as changing existing law; it makes no attempt to change the law.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understand that if the appropriation item is fixed at \$1 per annum as his salary, that fixes the salary.

Mr. NORRIS. In effect, it might do that—

Mr. FLETCHER. It destroys the power of the board.

Mr. NORRIS. In effect it might do that for the fiscal year for which the appropriation was made, but it only does that from the fact that he could not sue the Government of the United States. The salary would still be the same, but he would have no method of collecting it. That would be the only difference. It would be an impossibility to collect it unless Congress should consent for the suit to be brought.

Mr. FLETCHER. Is it not, in effect, changing such salary upon an appropriation bill changing general legislation which Congress has previously enacted?

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. FLETCHER. The board would be powerless to do what Congress authorized it to do in the organic act creating the board.

Mr. NORRIS. No; the board is not powerless, but the fact that the law gives the board the authority to fix the salary does not give the board the authority to pay it. There is only one way to get money out of the Treasury of the United States, and that is through an appropriation by Congress. If Congress refused to appropriate anything for the President's salary or for Senators' salaries they could not get anything; there is not any way to get it; but they might have a claim for the money, if they had some tribunal in which they could enforce it. Unfortunately, however, for them in that case, there would not be any such tribunal.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator for a question.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I want to get the matter clearly in my mind. The law creating this board said that the members of the board should name such officers as seemed best to them, and should determine in advance how much their pay should be. This bill now not only names the officers but also names the pay. How can the Senator from Nebraska or how can any other Senator on this floor say that that is not general legislation? You have usurped a power clearly given to the board, that they shall name whatever officers in their judgment are proper.

Mr. NORRIS. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Just let me make the idea clearer.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It does not affect the status of the Senate and of this board to say that the Appropriations Committee has taken exactly the names of the officers that the board had fixed. The mere fact that those are put in here, that the other House and the Senate are naming these men and fixing the salaries does not change the situation, when the statute says that the board shall name the men and fix the salaries.

I agree with the Senator that when it comes to paying the money we are the ones to say whether or not it shall be paid, but in this case you are usurping a prerogative of the board.

Mr. NORRIS. All we are attempting to do here is to appropriate for the salaries. Now let us read it:

Federal Farm Loan Bureau: For four members of the board, at \$7,500 each; chief, bond division, \$3,000—

And so forth, making in all an appropriation of \$67,620 in that paragraph. There is an appropriation of \$67,620 divided among the officials named in the paragraph in the amount designated after each. There is no attempt to fix anybody's salary. If the official who is given by that appropriation \$7,500 is entitled under the law to a salary of \$10,000, as I understand he is, it is simply an act of Congress refusing to appropriate for his entire salary; that is all.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. Just a moment. Let me take that thought a little further. Suppose that Congress did not appropriate anything for any member of this board. Then they would not get any money. Suppose they undertook to get it. There is no tribunal in the United States where they could go and get it; there is no way to sue the United States, and they would not get anything. We have not changed any law; we have merely refused to pay them, and there is nobody who can compel us to do so. It is perfectly in order under this bill while the bill is pending for the Senator from South Carolina or any other Senator to move to strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$12,000." I am not making an argument against the reduction in salary; I am saying nothing about that. This is strictly a question of order.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Now, if the Senator will allow me—

Mr. NORRIS. But if the Senator's position is right, that we can not provide for any amount in the bill except the full amount of the salary, then what is the use of considering any of these matters? Why not pass a blanket resolution and say that every official shall go to the Treasury of the United States and get the amount of money that the law provides his salary shall be? If that contention is true, then all our appropriation bills are practically useless; there is no sense in them, and there is no use in devoting our time to them.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me—

Mr. NORRIS. I yield further to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I am not arguing that we have not the right to decrease salaries if we see fit to do so. The point I am making is that a statute, a law, provides that this board shall name these officers—they may name a dozen or may curtail the number to six or to five—and they shall also fix their salaries. Now, we on this appropriation bill have clearly changed existing law by doing what the statute says the board shall do. If the board were called in and asked how many offices they had created and they told the committee "We have created a dozen or a half dozen, and the total amount is so much," then it would have been clearly within the province of the Appropriations Committee to have said whether or not they would appropriate a sum sufficient to cover the amount; but I do maintain that the Appropriations Committee went into the field of general legislation when they named the officers and the salaries, whereas the statute says that the board beforehand and in advance should name the officers and fix their salaries.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to correct the Senator. We have not named the officers.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me a moment to correct the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator said we have named the officers. We sent to the board and asked them to let us know what offices they had established, the designation of those offices, and what salaries were authorized. They did that. We have not fixed them at all.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. If the Senator from Nebraska will allow me, I should like to answer the Senator from North Carolina. The committee, then, should have appropriated an amount sufficient to have covered the entire number and not designated the offices.

Mr. OVERMAN. We appropriated for the salaries exactly as the board fixed them and in the same number.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. But it was their province to name the officers, and the province of the committee to appropriate a lump sum. The law provides that the Farm Loan Board shall name the officers and fix their salaries.

Mr. OVERMAN. We did not name the officers; the board named them.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Of course, they may have named the officers; but the point I am contending for is that it was not within the province of the committee to name the officers and fix their salaries.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President I think I will claim the floor for a while. This bill does not change or attempt to change any law. I think, even if it did change the law we have been speaking of, it would not be general legislation; but I am not admitting that it changes any law whatever. The law provides that the board shall fix the salaries. The law has never provided that the board should appropriate money to pay them. That law remains the same as it was. The board still has the power to fix the salaries; and to-day while we are deliberating that board can change the salaries if they want to, either by increasing them to some other amount or reducing them, as they see fit.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President—

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield in just a moment.

Mr. SHIELDS. Right in that connection I should like to direct the Senator's attention to a matter. I understand that the Senator's opinion is that the Farm Loan Board has a right to fix the salaries?

Mr. NORRIS. I understand the law provides for that; yes.

Mr. SHIELDS. And that this section does not change that?

Mr. NORRIS. The section does not change that.

Mr. SHIELDS. Well, now, what is the effect of the first clause of this paragraph appropriating so much money for some dozen designated officers?

Mr. NORRIS. That means that those officers will get the amount of money appropriated.

Mr. SHIELDS. Does not that limit the power of the board to pay those specific officers the salaries the board have fixed?

Mr. NORRIS. No; the board has never had the power to pay them. We are the paying power.

Mr. SHIELDS. Then, does it not limit the amount at which the board can fix those salaries?

Mr. NORRIS. No; they are already fixed. It seems to me that Senators ought to get out of their minds that the fact that the board has the power to fix these salaries gives any greater force to the salaries when fixed than though Congress itself had fixed the salaries. It is legal in either case.

Mr. SHIELDS. I will ask the Senator this question: Out of the lump sum appropriated in the second paragraph, can the board pay the officers and employees mentioned in the first paragraph a larger sum than is there provided?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not understand what particular appropriation the Senator is referring to. There is not any lump sum provided in the second paragraph to cover appropriations made in the first paragraph.

Mr. OVERMAN. If the Senator will yield to me—

Mr. SHIELDS. One moment. I did not catch the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator is looking at the same paragraph I am, the first paragraph of the amendment on page 42, he will find that the first paragraph carries a total appropriation of \$67,620. There is no attempt in the next paragraph which follows to appropriate anything in addition for the items contained in the first paragraph.

Mr. SHIELDS. The first paragraph names certain employees.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SHIELDS. It appropriates so much money for their salaries.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SHIELDS. The second paragraph reiterates the general power of the board to appoint officers and fix their salaries, and appropriates the gross sum of \$182,380 for that purpose. Now, is not the first paragraph a limitation upon that general power by pointing out certain officers and fixing their salaries?

Mr. NORRIS. I think not. The second paragraph—

Mr. SHIELDS. Let me conclude my question.

Mr. NORRIS. Let me read the second paragraph.

Mr. SHIELDS. Then, if it is not a limitation on them, can not the board under the second paragraph pay the salaries in their own discretion to the full amount they have heretofore paid?

Mr. NORRIS. They could pay them, of course, but they could not use public money to pay them; they would have to pay them out of their own funds.

Mr. SHIELDS. Then, the first paragraph is a limitation upon their power to name the officers and fix their salaries.

Mr. NORRIS. No; they have never had that power; there is no law that gives them the power to pay these men. They can fix their salaries.

Mr. SHIELDS. But there is a law giving them power to name employees and fix their salaries.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes, sir; nobody disputes that.

Mr. SHIELDS. And the second paragraph contains a general appropriation, a lump sum, to pay salaries of that kind.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. SHIELDS. The two sections are certainly in conflict; and if in any way the power of the board given under the original act to name employees and to fix their salaries is limited by the first section, then that section is general legislation under the ruling of the Chair; and it seems to me to that extent the point of order ought to be sustained under the Chair's designation of what is general legislation.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, we ought to get clearly in mind the distinction between an appropriation and the fixing of a salary. There have been instances by the hundred in which the law has provided for a particular salary for a public official, and in which Congress has refused, in passing appropriation bills, to pay the entire salary, and sometimes has refused to pay any of the salary. Now, under the law, if it were an individual—if it were not the Government of the United States—the people aggrieved could go into court, could sue, and could recover. Next year, when this appropriation bill comes up—assuming now that no change is made in this amount—Congress may appropriate a different sum. It may appropriate, for instance, for the salary of the members of the board \$12,000 instead of \$7,500, and it would be in order. It is in order now to make that kind of an amendment. But to say absolutely that the committee, in bringing in this bill, have only one thing to do—to wit, to put in the amount of salary fixed by law—is to take away from them and from Congress any discretionary power whatever in making appropriations.

I am not contending that this is just. I am not making that point now. It is purely a question of law; and if the contention is correct that is made by those who think this point of order is good, then there is only one item that can be put in an appropriation bill for the salary of the members of this board, and that is \$12,000. If the board next year raised that salary to \$50,000, it would be out of order in an appropriation bill to put in any item except \$50,000; and next year they could raise it to a million dollars, and we would have to appropriate a million dollars. Anything else would be out of order, because they have authority to fix it.

Why, Mr. President, Congress can not be mandamusd to make an appropriation. For the purpose of the argument, let us assume that it is unjust and unfair. That makes no difference so far as the law that is involved is concerned. Congress has the right—and it is a right under the Constitution of the United States which can not be taken away by any statute or rule—to refuse to appropriate to pay any Federal official's salary. It can likewise refuse to appropriate the entire amount, and pay any smaller amount.

Several years ago the question arose, at one session of Congress, as to whether Members of Congress were entitled to mileage. It was claimed on the one side that they were entitled to mileage for an extra session that ran over into the regular session. It was contended on the other hand that they were not. I will say that the appropriation was defeated. There was one Member of the House who claimed that as a matter of law he was entitled to mileage. Congress did not appropriate it. There was only one way for him to get it. He came before Congress and asked Congress to pass a joint resolution permitting him to bring suit in the Court of Claims, and we passed it in order to enable him to bring suit to see whether he was entitled to it or not.

There is not any way to get money out of the Treasury of the United States except by appropriation of Congress, under the Constitution of the United States, and from the fact that a man has by law a salary coming to him it does not necessarily follow that he will get it. He must get Congress to appropriate the money, or he can not get it, and the fact that the salaries of these particular officials are fixed by a board gives to their salaries

and gives to the men to whom the salaries are to be given no greater privilege and no greater right than if those salaries had been originally fixed by an act of Congress.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President I am going to ask the Senate to indulge me while I remind them of what took place when this statute—the Federal farm-loan act—was passed.

We were all more or less in the dark as to what was needed to carry out the purposes of the act. It was a new project—one that was needed by the farmers in order that they might finance their business. We had provided for commercial loans and commercial banks under the national-bank act in 1864, and the time came when farmers were to be given the same facilities under the Government that merchants and manufacturers have enjoyed for 50 years. No one could tell in advance just what officers would be needed for the Farm Loan Board, and it was intended by the Senate and House of Representatives, and by the President when he signed the act, that these men should be given a free hand until the law which established the board should be changed. The time has not come when a limit should be set. The time probably will come in a year, or two years, or five years, when Congress can intelligently legislate; and the vice of this sort of legislation is shown by the situation that exists to-day.

If this amendment to the appropriation bill is adopted, the board is absolutely saddled for the next fiscal year, for a year from the 1st of next July, with some useless officers—for instance, the publicity agent at \$2,000 per year. There is no need of such an agent after the banks have once been started; but there is to be such a one under this provision of the amendment, and he is to be paid.

Something has been said about the secretary of the board. He is a man that I never knew until the rural-credits legislation was before Congress. He then came and volunteered his services, and for a year he worked with me on this bill without any pay of any sort. Later, when Congress provided a special joint committee on the subject, he was made secretary of that joint committee. When the time came to appoint the members of the Farm Loan Board I recommended him for a place on the board as being one of the two men in the United States that I had found who was best fitted to be upon the board. He was not appointed to the board, but the board appointed him secretary, and fixed his salary, as I am informed, at \$6,000 a year. I had nothing to do with fixing his salary, and I did not know what it was until this bill came up. He is a highly accomplished man. I undertake to say that he knows more about rural credits than any other man in the United States. For us to undertake to say now that the board can not have a highly accomplished man of that sort unless it can get such a man for \$3,000 is in the teeth of the statute.

We passed this statute deliberately. We knew what we were doing. This was done following the precedent established by Congress in creating the Federal Reserve Board. There, again, we were a good deal in the dark as to what the board would have to do, what agents and employees it would need, and we merely followed that precedent. We provided in section 3 of the act that the board shall consist of five members, and that they shall receive an annual salary of \$10,000 each, payable monthly, together with their actual and necessary traveling expenses.

I did not know one of the members of this board at the time they were appointed. I did not know one of them to speak to. They were no friends of mine, except that every man who is interested in this measure and is trying to carry it out is a friend of mine, constructively. But for the Congress now to assume the right, in the teeth of what it has formerly done, to cut down the salaries of those men is obviously intended to cripple this act, and it will be resented by the farmers of the United States in that way, and it rightly should be.

The members have not had a chance to prove themselves. We do not know whether they are going to prove to be \$10,000-a-year men or not. Personally I think they have done well and are \$10,000-a-year men. Later, if it proves that they are not, and that the services they render the country are not entitled to that recompense, then Congress should meet the issue man fashion and amend the Federal farm-loan act and reduce the salary; or, if it is found that they are worth more, Congress ought to amend the act and increase the salary. Instead of the Congress of the United States fixing the salary of these important officials, the Appropriations Committee undertake to do indirectly what they could not do by an amendment, and they may marshal the help of all the members of the Appropriations Committee to carry through what they could not do in any other way. I do not know about that.

Now, to proceed about the other employees, we provided in the same section:

The Federal Farm Loan Board shall be authorized and empowered to employ such attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, laborers, and other employees as it may deem necessary to conduct the business of said board.

The board has done that, and I wish to have the Senate understand that no annual salary has been fixed by the Farm Loan Board yet. All of these men are employed by the month. Some of them will not be required a few months later; others will be required in their places. The board have not yet set up the 12 banks. They were required by the act to investigate to see what the farm-loan needs of the country are. They have been busily engaged. They have traveled over the entire country, and they have held hearings, and have finally located the 12 banks; and I have heard very little dissatisfaction expressed with the location of the banks. I think the farming interests of the country are back of them in the locations they have made.

The next step is to open the books of the banks for subscriptions to stock. They are obliged to do that under the act for 30 days. They have opened the books, and until the subscriptions are all in, after the 30 days have expired, they can not take the next move, but after the subscriptions are in the Government will take the rest of the stock which has not been subscribed for. Then it is the duty of the Farm Loan Board to select five directors for each of the 12 Federal land banks. That will be done, and then the land banks will be set up. Then the duties of the Farm Loan Board will instantly change again, and they will have to be supervisory instead of creative, and they will need a different set of officers. They will need men of a different sort.

Take this bond man that is provided in the amendment—the chief of the bond division. I am informed that the board has employed a man who is skilled in the sale of bonds. This board will have to supervise the issue of more bonds than any other bond house that ever existed in this country or any other. There will be millions and millions of them, and they ought to have the best bond man that can be obtained in the country. It will be good economy. This committee, sitting up here in the Capitol, with no special knowledge of the issue of bonds or the farm-loan act, assume to say that instead of paying a man \$3,900—if that is it—they shall pay him \$3,000. They assume to say that they shall have a publicity agent at \$2,000 a year instead of \$75 a week, which is what they are paying him now; and they assume to say that he must be paid that.

I undertake to say that legislation of this sort on an appropriation bill controls the general functions and purposes of the board, it controls the purposes of the act, and is general legislation; and I hope the Senate will take that view of it. So far as the salaries of the board are concerned, I am not afraid that the board members are not going to get their \$10,000. I do not think even the committee will stand for that now.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to call the Senator's attention to the first part of the appropriation bill, which reads as follows:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, namely:

Of course, that clearly places a limitation upon the amount to be paid to the members of the board. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] that the provision itself would not be a change of existing law; but, taking the act as a whole, it clearly is legislation and it clearly does change existing law, because it would be impossible to pay these men any more than the \$7,500.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me? I want to get in the RECORD at this point something along that line.

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator read this language:

The following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. OVERMAN. That question has been decided by the courts several times. I have one decision here to the effect that when Congress appropriates a sum in full compensation of the salary of a public officer the incumbent can not recover an additional amount, notwithstanding the prior statute fixes the salary at a larger amount than the sum so appropriated. That is a case in the United States Supreme Court, United States

against Fisher, One hundred and ninth United States, page 143. This is exactly in line with the point the Senator makes.

Mr. HOLLIS. That is the case I referred to this morning in One hundred and ninth United States, and it is followed immediately by the case of United States against Mitchell, which holds the same thing. Those cases are well known; but that is exactly the point. These men who have been selected to draw \$10,000 a year and who have been given terms of two, four, six, and eight years, have given up their other occupations and have come to Washington and have established themselves on a \$10,000 a year basis. Now, in this indirect way the old fight on their salaries is renewed, the fight that went on here last summer, both in the Committee of the Whole and in the Senate, where eventually the salary was fixed at \$10,000; and to undertake to change an important act of this kind in this indirect way I believe is general legislation.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from New Hampshire another question?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield further.

Mr. GRONNA. Does the Senator from New Hampshire believe that it will be possible to carry on this work for the amount appropriated here, \$67,000?

Mr. OVERMAN. The amount is \$280,000. The Senator is mistaken about that.

Mr. HOLLIS. They are given \$250,000 altogether under this amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. That is for all the employees; not only for the bureau, but for all the farm-loan banks.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is what they have asked for.

Mr. HOLLIS. They asked for \$300,000. The House provided \$300,000 and the Senate committee cut the amount to \$250,000. I do not know whether that will be enough or not. If it is not, I hope they will proceed and come to Congress for a further appropriation, and I believe they will get it.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is no trouble about that.

Mr. HOLLIS. I am not troubled about that.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; there is no trouble about that.

Mr. HOLLIS. Now, if I may be permitted to finish, I will not be long.

The effect of the first paragraph of this amendment, if it is adopted, is, of course, to fix these offices and fix these salaries for a year in contravention of the act. It does not make any difference what the second paragraph says.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just at this point: The Senator from New Hampshire is, to the certain knowledge of the Chair, a fine lawyer. What is his construction of this language of the act?

All salaries and fees authorized in this section and not otherwise provided for.

It does not read "not otherwise provided for herein," but "not otherwise provided for."

Mr. HOLLIS. I understand that to mean "provided for in the act," because the salaries of the board are fixed, and other fees are fixed in the act. That is my understanding of it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The language of it, however, is not "not otherwise provided for herein."

Mr. HOLLIS. It might be taken to apply generally.

The undoubted effect of the first paragraph will be to fix these positions and fix the salaries of these positions for the next year; and the second paragraph will not be taken by the board to be authority to exceed those salaries. For instance, the board would not feel authorized under this amendment, if it should be adopted, to increase the salary of the secretary. I think that would be highly improper if it were done. It would not be permitted, I should say, to employ two publicity agents, or more than four private secretaries, if those are needed. The result would be to cripple the act.

I think the third paragraph of the amendment has not been properly considered. That is undoubtedly general legislation. It reads as follows:

Estimates in detail for all expenditures under the Federal Farm Loan Bureau for the fiscal year 1919, and annually thereafter, shall be submitted to Congress in the annual Book of Estimates.

When we passed the farm-loan act we especially avoided that, and intended to do so, because no one can tell in this new field what will be needed the next year or the year after. The time will undoubtedly come when that may be put in the annual Book of Estimates and the Senate Committee on Appropriations may be guided and bound by it to a certain extent, but it has not come yet. The board has not been appointed six months. The act has been passed for only a little less than six months, and it is impossible to tell.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. MYERS. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WALSH. I ask my colleague, I suppose it is for the purpose of continuing the consideration of the appropriation bill?

Mr. MYERS. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Hampshire will proceed.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from Utah called attention to page 79 of Senate Precedents, in which the matter of general legislation is thoroughly considered and decided by Vice President Sherman. The distinction is there made by the Vice President:

Of course it would be general legislation were it in the words suggested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Bacon] "that hereafter," etc. That would make it general legislation, but in the form in which it is presented, being an appropriation for the one fiscal year, it seems to the Chair the amendment is in the nature of a limitation upon the appropriation for that fiscal year, and does not become general legislation.

The amendment that we are considering provides not only for the fiscal year but annually thereafter, bringing it clearly within the ruling of Vice President Sherman, and on these grounds I ask the Senate to decide the appeal contrary to the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I wish to have the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. Hollis] for just a minute.

Mr. HOLLIS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Does the Senator consider those three paragraphs as one amendment, which are all subject to the same point of order?

Mr. HOLLIS. Yes; they can not be divided under the ruling of the Chair. It is a motion to strike out and insert, and a motion to strike out and insert can not be divided.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I understand; but the third paragraph proposing that annually hereafter a return shall be submitted to Congress in the annual Book of Estimates is clearly general legislation.

Mr. HOLLIS. I think so.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. In my opinion, Mr. President, the other two paragraphs are not general legislation. I will not ask the Senator to stand and listen to me. I have finished the question I wanted to ask him.

Mr. HOLLIS. I should like to add before I take my seat that the point has already been ruled on by the Chair and decided.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. And there is an appeal.

Mr. HOLLIS. No; the point that the amendment must be considered as one has been ruled on by the Chair and not appealed from.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I accept that statement.

Mr. HOLLIS. The question now is whether the point of order shall be sustained.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Chair overruled the point of order, I understand.

Mr. HOLLIS. He did.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, as to the question whether this changes any existing law, even if that were subject to making a point of order, I simply want to say that the first paragraph, it seems to me, does nothing but make an appropriation. It fails to appropriate the full amount of salary provided for in the farm-loan act. It does not in any way repeal the farm-loan act nor purport to amend it at all. I understand that under this amendment the members of the board will get only three-quarters of the salary which was provided for in the act. The next Congress may give them the full amount. The farm-loan act would stand right straight through untouched and unmodified in any respect whatever.

Mr. OVERMAN. Congress could give them \$25,000.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes. The mere failure to appropriate does not constitute an act of general legislation, of course. The point of order is that this is general legislation, whereas it is a mere failure of Congress to appropriate the amount of salary which some previous Congress had provided by legislation. Clearly the first two paragraphs would not be legislation; but the third paragraph clearly is legislation, in my opinion.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Certainly.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to call the attention of the Senator before he takes his seat to the fact that our fight on

the floor has been really with reference to the first and second paragraphs.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Yes; that is what I heard.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The third is really a very immaterial paragraph.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It is utterly unrelated to the other two paragraphs.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It is immaterial. The really important issue has been whether the Appropriations Committee can classify the salaries to be paid to employees of the Farm Loan Board when the act originally creating the board gave them a lump sum and let them classify them themselves. I regard it as very important to sustain the right of the Committee on Appropriations to get away from lump-sum appropriations and to classify and specify the amount to be paid to each individual. I think if that were done everywhere it would result in a very large saving and economy to the Government.

I wanted to call the Senator's attention to this provision which the Chair called to the attention of the Senator from New Hampshire:

All salaries and fees authorized in this section and not otherwise provided for shall be fixed in advance—

And so forth.

That language itself was intended, it seems to me, to clearly reserve the right to Congress in an appropriation bill to fix the salaries of the various employees to suit themselves.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I did not think anyone would make a point of order on the paragraph which simply asks these men to submit estimates in detail for all expenditures under the bureau for the fiscal year 1919 and annually thereafter, and when the time comes I will agree to strike out the words "and annually thereafter," which would make it in order according to the ruling of the Chair.

Some years ago both Houses provided that the details should be given. We found some astonishing facts under the lump-sum appropriations that were made. We found that in departments, when Congress had refused to raise the salaries of clerks, they were transferring clerks from one department at \$1,800 and paying them \$2,700 and \$3,600 and \$4,000 at their own sweet will without Congress knowing anything about it. So the policy since that time has been to require them to furnish a detailed statement of what they have been doing. When these bureaus are established we have to give them a lump sum, and then require them to furnish us the details so that Congress can keep an eye on what they are doing. If we did not do that, they might provide \$6,000 or \$10,000 for an official, and the committee wants to know every year by a detailed statement what has been done with the lump sum of money.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENYON in the chair). Does the Senator from North Carolina yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield.

Mr. GALLINGER. The contention of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] has a great deal of force, that in the third paragraph of the proposed amendment the words "and annually thereafter" may be general legislation, but the Senator from North Carolina can, in behalf of the committee, modify the amendment by withdrawing those words.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do modify it by striking out the words "and annually thereafter."

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, a point of order. Do I understand the Senator in charge of the bill, without consulting his committee, can change the amendment?

Mr. OVERMAN. I have consulted some of the members of the committee, and they agreed to strike out the words "and annually thereafter."

Mr. HOLLIS. I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he has held a meeting of the committee?

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator will excuse me. I think the chairman of a subcommittee, the Senator in charge of a bill, always has a right to change any wording, providing it does not change the substance. I have always exercised that authority.

Mr. HOLLIS. The very purpose of the change is to alter the substance so as to have the amendment ruled in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Not at all. Instead of requiring an estimate every year, I simply modify it to ask for one next year.

Mr. HOLLIS. The Senator does not understand me. He purposely withdraws certain words in order to make the amendment in order. Then he says he has the right to change something that is not material.

Mr. OVERMAN. I have the right simply—

Mr. HOLLIS. It is either material or it is not. He does not assume the right to change anything material, and if he

does not make the proper change it is not material. So, either way, I do not see that he accomplishes what he desires.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, as a member of the committee, I wish to say that I think the Senator in charge of the bill will have no difficulty in getting the consent of the committee to the change, but I suggest that he make the motion from his place in the Senate, and I think the committee will sustain him in voting for it.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question. I thoroughly agree with the Senator in his desire to get from the Farm Loan Board information with reference to the salaries of employees of that department to be appropriated for by the Congress. I think that is a very wise provision in all legislation of this character. Having been detained from the Senate during the discussion of the first paragraph of the amendment, to get the information I desire, I may be compelled to ask the Senator to repeat, but I should like for the Senator to explain to me, if he has already explained it to the Senate, what process of reasoning the committee pursued in reaching the conclusion that the salaries of the members of the Farm Loan Board should be reduced from \$10,000 to \$7,500?

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. VARDAMAN. Before the Senator answers that question I will state that I was one of the Senators who insisted when the bill creating the office was before the Senate on fixing the salary at \$7,500. I should like to have had that done but my judgment was not accepted by the Senate and the law as we find it on the statute books was passed, the members of the board were appointed, and they have entered upon the discharge of their duties under the law. It does not seem to me that it would be acting in good faith with them now to reduce the salary. Will the Senator answer that question?

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator voted to fix the salary at \$7,500 when the act was before the Senate. I thought as the Senator did, but inasmuch as the salary had been fixed at \$10,000 by the law I voted against it. However, the committee thought \$7,500 was a sufficient amount to pay these men, and our policy is, whenever an appropriation bill comes in, to reduce other salaries along the line of retrenchment and give such salary as in the judgment of the committee is a sufficient amount for the services performed. For example—

Mr. VARDAMAN. I want to act in perfect harmony with the committee, I want to be in complete accord with the Members of my party in this body, but I do not think it is honest, I do not think it is the clean, proper thing to do after these men have been appointed to this office for the Appropriations Committee to come along and fix their salary at \$2,500 less than Congress agreed to pay them in creating the office. It is bad faith, and I can not understand the process of reasoning which led the committee to such an erroneous conclusion.

Mr. THOMAS. Might we not on the same principle reduce the salaries \$2,500 more and compel the resignation of the board?

Mr. VARDAMAN. We could abolish the office or make the salary so small that no self-respecting man would retain the office.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President—

Mr. VARDAMAN. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania. Mr. OLIVER. I suggest to the Senator from Mississippi that at the time these salaries were fixed the necessities of the National Treasury were not so urgent as they are now and the necessity for economy was not so apparent. The salaries were fixed at \$10,000 each by a very close vote, and afterwards the salaries of the members of a far more important commission were fixed at a lower sum, \$7,500. I refer to the Tariff Commission. I think if we are going to attempt to economize, and apparently we are, because we are refusing to increase the salaries of employees who are lower paid, we ought to try to economize on the salaries of the highly and extravagantly paid heads of bureaus and commissions that have been created of late years.

Mr. VARDAMAN. In reply to what the Senator has said, I want to remind him that the committee is the servant of Congress and not its master. It is not the province of the Appropriations Committee to change a law of this character in this way. If it desired to change the salaries fixed in the bill creating the Federal Farm Loan Board, it should have done so by reporting a bill for that purpose rather than reducing the salaries in the appropriation bill. Nor do I agree with the Senator that the salaries of far more important commissions have been fixed at \$7,500. There is no more important commission created by this Congress or any other Congress than the one we are now considering. If you want to economize in the interests of the American people, in the interest of Democratic-Republican

government, cut out the appropriation for some of the battleships and reduce the expenses for military preparation which are not needed. This Farm Loan Board was created to serve that class of American people who, unfortunately, receive less attention at the hands of Congress than any other class of our citizenship—the class whose toil produces the wealth of this country, maintains its commerce in time of peace, and who in time of war fight the Nation's battles. This Farm Loan Board was created to serve the farmer. It is the first time in the history of the Government that an effective scheme has been provided under Government control by which the man who tills the soil shall be enabled to get cheap money with which to develop his farm, improve his home, and make farm life more tolerable. This insidious effort to discriminate against the farmer, to cripple and destroy this great scheme, especially designed to serve the farmer, is not creditable to Congress. The operation of the board is to be hindered, delayed, embarrassed, its members are to be insulted by withholding the necessary funds with which to carry out the purposes of the bill, reduce the salaries of the members thereof. I repeat, to put the matter mildly, it is not fair, it is not just, it is not honest.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. VARDAMAN. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to call the Senator's attention to a fact which perhaps he and other Senators have not taken into consideration, that the salaries paid to this board are higher than the salaries paid for just as important work performed in other departments of the Government. When asked to increase salaries in other departments, heads of divisions, or heads of bureaus, the Commissioner of Pensions, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and hundreds of other important positions, our attention is called to salaries paid to the recent commissions created by Congress, and we are asked why similar salaries are not paid the officials and employees of the other departments of the Government. I think there ought to be at least a reasonable equality.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator is talking about something now that I am not criticizing the committee for doing at all. I am not animadverting upon the action of the committee with reference to the minor officers or employees of this board. I do not know anything about that; you may have fixed the salaries large enough; but I am discussing the question as to whether Congress can afford to treat in this way the commissioners who were appointed with the understanding that they were to receive \$10,000 a year, and after they had been appointed and entered upon the discharge of the duties of their office and now in this appropriation bill to reduce the salaries. I do not really think it is decent to do it.

Mr. SMOOT. This is the only way to reduce the salary. I want to say to the Senator now that the salary provided by the committee of \$7,500 is 50 per cent greater than the salary provided for the Commissioner of Pensions or the Commissioner of the General Land Office.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I agree with the Senator that the salary of \$7,500 is enough. I voted for it originally. But you do not propose to change that law by this enactment. You are only making it applicable for one year. You promised these men \$10,000 a year, and that was done by Congress, by this very body, and now it is proposed that after they have been appointed and entered upon the discharge of their duties to say to them, "You shall have only \$7,500." Now, the Senator does not think that is right. He would not do that in dealing with an employee of his. I submit that the same moral law should govern the Nation in dealings with its employees that controls honorable men in their dealings with each other in the affairs of private life.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; but it is not for this year; it is for the next year. If the Senator's position was right the salary would never be changed. You never hear any objection at all when increases of salary are made. Nobody ever speaks of that—

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should object to it very earnestly.

Mr. SMOOT. I mean upon the same ground the Senator states.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have no personal interest in this matter. No member of the board is anything to me, except as an officer of this Government.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course not.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I think \$7,500 a year is a large enough salary and all that the law should have promised in the beginning, but it is not all they are entitled to under the act creating the office and to which they were appointed.

Mr. SMOOT. But this bill, if enacted into law, will not take effect until the 1st day of July this year, and it provides a salary from that time on for one year.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Is not this the first salary that is paid them?

Mr. SMOOT. No; they have been drawing \$10,000 a year.

Mr. VARDAMAN. How long have they been drawing it?

Mr. SMOOT. Since their confirmation, and they will receive a salary at the rate of \$10,000 per year until the 30th of June of this year even if this bill passes reducing their salary.

Mr. VARDAMAN. But they will not draw it for a year?

Mr. SMOOT. They will draw it from the time they were confirmed by the Senate until the 30th day of June, 1917.

Mr. VARDAMAN. But that will not be a year.

Mr. SMOOT. I think it is nearly a year. The law was approved July 17, 1916, and they were appointed shortly after that date. I have not here the journal record showing the exact date, but from the date they were confirmed they have been drawing at the rate of \$10,000 a year and will do so until the 30th of June, 1917.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should be very glad to vote to reduce the salary to \$7,500 to take effect after the terms for which these men were appointed expires, but I do not think it is treating them fairly to reduce the salary for the terms for which they were appointed. I do not think it is just to that great function created by the Government in the interest of the agriculturists of the Republic, and therefore I hope the Senate may not agree to the proposition to reduce in this way the salaries.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. VARDAMAN. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to say, as the Senator knows, that this is upon a question of order now. If the Chair is sustained and the Senator desires to offer an amendment of that kind after the Chair is sustained, it will be in order. We can amend it at any time or as we please after we vote on the pending question.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I have nothing further to say, Mr. President. I simply wanted to protest against what I believe to be a great injustice both to the Senate and the members of the Farm Loan Board.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Mr. President, I think that the committee of the Senate is likely to act in direct opposition to what was intended when the act was formulated and passed. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS], who had charge of the bill in its passage and who has been very zealous in getting it to become a law, has stated the case more exactly than any other that I have heard yet, and that is that here is a universal proposition, one fraught with more interest to the American people than any bill that has been passed in the history of Congress in their material welfare. It is a bill to enter an entirely new field, without precedent. None of us can determine what are going to be the developments under the operation of the Farm Loan Board and what is going to be the result in the offering of its bonds on the market. One of the most important things is to get started right at the beginning, and for that reason in the discussion of the measure on its passage particular care was taken to guard against any specific legislation which might be ill advised and cripple the board in its general work.

Now, as a specific case, in carrying out that idea none of the subofficers under the Farm Loan Board were named in the body of the act, but the discretion was given the board to get just such men as in their judgment would best carry out the provisions of the law. They were to name in advance the amount to be paid these employees and the duties that they were to perform specifically for the reason that neither we nor they were competent to judge just what was going to be the development when they came to establishing a rural-credit system in America, a thing that had never been attempted before.

There was debate as to the amount of salary to be paid these men. The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] has compared the salary of \$10,000 with that of other heads of bureaus. There is not a department nor a bureau in the Government that has as grave responsibility laid upon it as these men charged with the relief of the agricultural States of this country in the development of that upon which we all depend, covering the entire United States under their immediate observation. These men have to travel throughout the country and locate the land banks. They are now charged with the responsibility of deciding who are the proper persons to carry on the banking business in the several districts created.

It seems to me that the House acted wisely and showed evidence of seasoned statesmanship when, in the initial period, in the beginning of the operation of the Farm Loan Board, they carried out the intent and purposes of Congress in enacting the

law by simply observing strictly the terms of the act in their appropriation.

I appreciate what the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] who has charge of the bill said, that there has been perhaps an abuse of the lump-sum appropriation; but is that any reason why we, as wise men in such an important piece of legislation, should follow the report of the committee? Necessity demands that at the initial period of the life of the Farm Loan Board, when we can not legislate intelligently as to the specific officers and the functions of the office, we should give them a lump sum. It will be ample time for us to see that they make specific appropriations when the overhead charges, as manufacturers and business men call the establishment of a plant, shall have been provided for, when the machinery is in operation. When by process of elimination and substitution we have all the different functions of this new undertaking clearly defined and in working order, then an amendment such as is proposed by the Senate committee would be in order. But you have a brand-new thing that none of us knows anything about. We have tried to select men who know something about it. We have clothed it with certain privileges and certain freedom of action that would not be proper if the thing were already established and in working order.

As to the change from \$10,000 to \$7,500. That question was debated on this floor. This is identically the same body that said to them in the statute you shall get \$10,000. We said it by a majority vote. Now, the Appropriations Committee proposes to say to these men in effect, "We did not know that you were going to be selected. We have made your salary \$10,000 in the original act. Now that you have been selected we do not believe you are worth it." If I were a member of that board, I would resign instantly if it were done. If I knew the men, I do not believe that a reduction to \$7,500 would have any effect, so far as their financial relations to the office are concerned. I do not believe that they would hesitate to continue their work if it were clearly understood that we have reduced it because we have gotten so miserably poor that we can not afford to pay it, or that there was some good substantial reason why we should not pay it; but to let it go out before the public that we by some legal enactment promised unknown men \$10,000 and the minute we knew them reduced it to \$7,500 is not only a breach of contract but an insult to the men who have not yet proven whether they are worth it or not.

I had rather reduce the salaries in every established bureau whose officers are now known, whose capacity is known, than to take three men who were promised a salary of \$10,000 when the matter was merely academic, and then, when we know the specific personnel, to say to them, "We will only give you \$7,500; you do not look like you are worth any more." I waive the question of honesty which the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] has brought out. We have made a contract with these men, and I should like to keep it.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. BRADY. I want to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the \$10,000 salary for this board is the only salary that this body specifically fixed, and now, at the first session after passing that law, we are trying to reduce the salary.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Precisely. I want to emphasize one other point, Mr. President. I am not going to attempt to array class against class, but we have been creating commission after commission—a Federal Trade Commission, a Civil Service Commission; we have created an Interstate Commerce Commission to look after trade; we passed a Federal reserve act to look after banking; we provided ample means for their support; and here, right on the threshold of the first time that the agriculturists of this country have been recognized upon the footing of business men, when we have organized great institutions, our farm-loan banks, our special organization, with its tributaries throughout the different districts—right in the beginning, before we have had time to test whether or not these men are worth a salary of \$10,000, we propose to cast an insinuation on them to the effect that the functions of this board are on a parity with the functions of other departments of the Government.

I mean to say here to-day that, if the Farm Loan Board discharges the functions for which we created it and realizes that for which we have been striving, its members are not only worth \$10,000 a year, but they would be worth \$50,000 a year to this country in actual returns in the development of our undeveloped resources in an agricultural sense.

Mr. President, from every standpoint I still maintain that when the Farm Loan Board was clothed with the power to name

the officers under them—their clerks, their bond listers, and the different offices that must be created to carry out the purposes of the act—when Congress said that they should have the right to name those officers and we in an appropriation bill name them, we have been guilty of an usurpation in violation of the clear, express terms of the statute.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Senator from South Carolina does not think the ruling of the Vice President is wrong, does he?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I want the Senator to get the point that I am making. It seems to me not quite clear in the minds of others, though it is so in my own mind. I do not say that Congress has not the power to appropriate any amount it pleases for this purpose, but it has not the power to name these officers, because the statute says the Farm Loan Board shall name them, and yet we propose to name them.

Mr. HARDWICK. The pending proposition, if the Senator will pardon me, was whether or not Congress had the power in an appropriation bill to fix the salaries of the Farm Loan Board.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; this other question was brought in—the question as to whether or not this was general legislation.

Mr. HARDWICK. The Vice President did not rule on both those questions together.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Yes; he did. The Vice President ruled, as I understood the ruling of the Chair, that this was not general legislation.

Mr. HARDWICK. I understand—

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. General legislation is the change of a statute that is general, and if this is not general legislation it is a modification of general legislation, and is in its nature to that extent general. The act says that the Farm Loan Board shall name its subofficers, leaving out the question of salary.

Mr. HARDWICK. Will the Senator pardon me just a moment? Would the Senator mind having the Secretary state the proposition which the Vice President ruled on, for I do not agree with him exactly about what the precise pending question is?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do not object to having that done.

Mr. HARDWICK. I should like to have that done if it will not bother the Senator, because I want to know, and I might agree with him. What is the amendment with respect to which the ruling was made?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary informs the Chair that he is unable to state the exact point.

Mr. HARDWICK. Does the Chair know which amendment the Vice President held was not subject to the point of order made against it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Beginning at the bottom of page 41 and extending on through the amendment to the bottom of page 42.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. It was in the amendment of the Senate committee which was proposed in lieu of the House text.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, my understanding is—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from Georgia that the Chair ruled that the amendment could not be divided.

Mr. HARDWICK. So the point of order was made against it all and it remained in that shape.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator from South Carolina yield to me a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I do.

Mr. ROBINSON. It seems to me that the ruling of the Chair is correct, as a matter of law; and it is my purpose, if the Chair is sustained, to offer an amendment to the committee amendment making the salaries of these officers \$10,000; that is, restoring the salary that is authorized by existing law.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield the floor?

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. No; Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not ask the Senator to do so. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I will yield if the Senator desires me to do so, but he says he does not.

Mr. President, I am clearly convinced in my own mind, as a matter of course, if the ruling of the Chair is sustained that this is not general legislation, then amendments will be in order; but I wanted particularly to emphasize the importance of not crippling this board, or indirectly or directly doing or saying anything at the very beginning of the work of this board in its relation to the agriculturists of this country, in its relation to the farmers, which would be so injurious as this proposed action.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me, the Vice President's ruling, in my opinion, was undoubtedly correct, and if the Senate sustains that ruling, that still leaves the Senate full liberty of action.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I understand that; but I am now arguing that we shall reverse the action of the Senate committee and sustain the House of Representatives in the proposition to pay these officers the \$10,000 salary, at least until we have proven whether or not it will be money well spent both in the salaries of the men and in what they shall achieve in the discharge of their duty.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President, I want to say but a word or two about this question. I am somewhat in sympathy with the view expressed by the Senator from South Carolina and with the view of other Senators, to the effect that we ought to give the Farm Loan Board every reasonable facility to discharge its functions and to carry out the business for which it has been appointed. I admit my further sympathy for the proposition that when men have been appointed to office with the understanding expressed in the statute that they were to receive certain compensation, it does look rather hard for Congress to reduce that compensation quite so soon as is proposed here, although I will say that originally I thought that \$7,500 was quite enough to pay them, and I still think so. There may be, however, some element of equity in the contention which is now made on their behalf, that after they were appointed with the understanding that they would get \$10,000 a year, we ought not right away to reduce the salary to \$7,500.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. Will the Senator from Georgia permit me to make a suggestion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. SMITH of South Carolina. I voted for the salary of \$7,500 when the bill was on its passage.

Mr. HARDWICK. I know the Senator did, and he and I, as I recall it, voted together on that proposition; but, Mr. President, I do not want the Senate to get away from the precise point at issue, because I think we would be making a very serious mistake if we were to establish the precedent here of overruling the Vice President's decision in this matter when it is eminently correct, and when, to overrule it and to establish the contrary precedent, would be most dangerous to the future conduct of the business of this body.

The Vice President of the United States ruled that the point of order that this was general legislation in connection with an appropriation bill was not good when directed against that part of the bill as is contained on page 42, providing for this Farm Loan Board and its various officers. The contention made was that Congress was compelled to appropriate \$10,000 as salary to the members of the Farm Loan Board, because the statute creating these offices fixed the salary at \$10,000. As a matter of fact, Mr. President, if the Senate of the United States were to ever hold that, it would abdicate a great part of its power—the power of the Congress of the United States over the purse. That power is absolute and exclusive and ought never to be impaired by limiting it or fettering it in any manner whatsoever. One Congress of the United States can not by law create an office and provide a compensation for it which a future Congress may not either decrease or increase according to its will at the moment when it makes an appropriation.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do.

Mr. HOLLIS. If the Senator will allow me, does he not think that the proper way to do it would be to amend the bill by reversing the prior action of Congress and changing the salaries in the act itself, and not indirectly?

Mr. HARDWICK. There would be nothing improper in that; but I want to say to the Senator that in the legislative and parliamentary history of this country it never has been held to be necessary to do that in either House of Congress, and the Senator can not point to a single such instance. On the contrary, in the other House of Congress, by express rule, any

proposition to reduce a salary is in order at any time on any appropriation bill. The rule there, Mr. President, is that you shall not change existing law in an appropriation bill. The rule here is that you shall not enact general legislation in connection with an appropriation bill—an entirely different thing, as Senators will observe.

My proposition is—and the Senator from New Hampshire must recognize its force—that no Congress of the United States by a statute creating an office and fixing its salary can commit future Congresses not to either reduce or increase that salary at a subsequent time if, in their judgment, it is then proper to reduce or to increase the salary.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The third paragraph of this amendment reads:

Estimates in detail for all expenditures under the Federal Farm Loan Bureau for the fiscal year 1919, and annually thereafter—

Does not the Senator think that is clearly general legislation which prescribes what shall be done hereafter?

Mr. HARDWICK. Well, I do not think so.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The provision continues:

shall be submitted to Congress in the annual Book of Estimates—

The Senator in charge of the bill admitted that that was general legislation—

Mr. HARDWICK. It is not; it is a mere regulation.

Mr. VARDAMAN. And the Senator in charge of the bill accepted an amendment striking at that part of the paragraph.

Mr. HARDWICK. Let me answer the Senator's question. Of course, if he wants to ask it and answer it, too, then I will not trouble to answer it; but I can answer it, I think.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I should be very glad to have the Senator answer it if it will not inconvenience the Senator to do so.

Mr. HARDWICK. My answer to it is this: That provision is a mere regulation of the expenditures, and provides for a report only. It is a mere regulation of a detail in connection with money that Congress appropriates. It is to secure for Congress information on which to base its action, and for that reason I do not regard it as a legislative provision.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry, which is whether the modification suggested by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] striking out the words "annually thereafter"—

Mr. HARDWICK. That would certainly relieve it from any possible criticism.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I was going to ask whether that modification suggested by the Senator from North Carolina had been made in the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As the Chair understands the parliamentary situation, the only question before the Senate is whether the ruling of the Chair shall stand as the judgment of the Senate; and pending that the amendment of the Senator from North Carolina would not be in order.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia permit me further?

Mr. HARDWICK. I do not yield to the Senator for a moment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. There was an appeal from the ruling of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The appeal is now pending.

Mr. HARDWICK. I should like to know whether the language has been modified by striking out those words?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That is what I am trying to find out.

Mr. SMOOT. The words "annually thereafter" have only reference to "estimates in detail for all expenditures under the Federal Farm Loan Bureau." They have nothing whatever to do with the appropriations.

Mr. HARDWICK. They have nothing whatever to do with the other provisions, except to say that Congress shall have such estimates in the future.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But it is a provision that extends beyond the life of the appropriation bill.

Mr. HARDWICK. Suppose it is?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Then it is general legislation.

Mr. HARDWICK. No.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Because it requires it to be done by this board every year; and that is clearly inappropriate on an appropriation bill. I supposed that the Senator from North Carolina had been allowed to modify that language.

Mr. HARDWICK. He did suggest that he would modify it in that connection, but I do not really take the same serious view of that provision as the Senator does, because it looks to me like it is a mere way of getting information that Congress is entitled to have.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It is; but sometimes it is necessary to provide legislation in order to get information.

Mr. HARDWICK. Even if, Mr. President, that part of the amendment is subject to the criticism the Senator makes—and there is some doubt in my mind as to that—I did not pay any particular attention to that—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state—

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If I may be allowed—

Mr. HARDWICK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am very certain the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] in charge of the bill, when he left the floor a few moments ago, thought that he had been allowed to strike those words out, so as to relieve it of that objection, but I can not so state positively.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the Chair's understanding that the only question now is on the appeal, and until that is withdrawn the amendment would not be in order.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It was not an amendment. It is a question of whether the Senator who had proposed the original amendment could modify his own amendment.

Mr. HARDWICK. Pending the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that the committee proposed it, according to the Senator from North Carolina, and it would be a committee amendment.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I thought the Senator from North Carolina was substantially authorized by the members of his committee to make the modification.

Mr. HARDWICK. Be that as it may, Mr. President, if the language is modified so as to meet that objection, I do not see how anyone could possibly contend with any degree of either force or plausibility that the Vice President's ruling was wrong. Congress can not by what are loosely called "organic laws" create offices and fix salaries that any subsequent Congress can not modify in an appropriation bill, and I think we would be in a very bad condition if any such precedent as that were established in this body. Consequently I hope the ruling of the Vice President will be sustained by the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Mr. President, very naturally there is a difference of opinion as to the ruling of the Chair, but I do not believe there is any division of opinion as to the rights which this ruling affects. I think we all agree that Congress has the authority to create positions of trust at a certain prescribed compensation, but that to enable their incumbents to receive their salaries there must be an appropriation made of the amount prescribed by law.

The consideration which shall most influence me in casting my vote on this matter is the duty of Congress, as I see it, after having taken action on this matter heretofore, during this session of Congress, when they do not know how important this board may be to the people of the Nation. We have no way of finding out until they shall have been tried.

These men were authorized by this Congress to fill certain positions at a certain salary prescribed by law, and until they have had a chance to demonstrate their ability and their worth to the people, personally I shall not cast my vote for any proposal to reduce their salaries.

When the Federal farm-loan act was before Congress, I went to those in charge of the measure and endeavored to have them make the salary of the members of the board \$7,500 each. They did not see fit to do so, but told me they had given long and studious consideration to this question, and as they had had the bill in their hands for many months I finally acquiesced in their wishes and opinions and voted for the salary which the law provides.

If the matter were to come before Congress to-day in its first stages, I might not cast my vote as I did then; and when I am asked to cast my vote in this body on a question of reducing salaries of those who have been legally appointed and authorized by law to perform this work, I should not feel that I was treating either the board or any of those under them fairly or honestly, if I did not cast my vote in such a way as to carry out the provisions of the law which now exists.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, before the Senator takes his seat—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not think that such action taken so soon after the creation

of this board would seem to be a reflection upon the board and upon the object for which it was created; in other words, an act of unfriendliness to it, which those who are to be the beneficiaries of the system would naturally and properly resent?

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota. Yes; I certainly would consider it very unwise and unbusinesslike, as well as unjustifiable, at this time, for the same Congress which created the amount fixed by law to be paid to take such action, and it would undoubtedly humiliate the board before they had really started in with the work as a board which they are authorized to do or been given the chance to even demonstrate their efficiency or ability to perform the duties given them under the law, or to give Congress some intelligent idea of their real worth to the people they are endeavoring to benefit.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, I desire to say a word in explanation of the vote which I intend to cast in support of the ruling of the Chair upon the point of order raised by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS]. I do not believe that the amendment is new legislation. I am very much opposed to lump-sum appropriations whenever they can possibly be avoided. On the other hand, I believe that under existing conditions we should permit the salary of the members of the Farm Loan Board to remain at \$10,000 per annum, the amount fixed in the original bill.

These men are working in a new field. They have a very hard task before them, and they are making, in my judgment, very good progress in the work which they have to do. They accepted these positions after Congress had passed a law fixing their salaries at \$10,000 per annum, and I believe that before we change their salaries we ought at least to give them an opportunity to demonstrate what they can do in the way of the organization of this new and very large institution, which we all hope will be of great benefit to the farmers of this country. For that reason I expect to vote to sustain the Chair, and I hope to have an opportunity to vote to increase the salary of the members of the board from the amount named in the amendment, which is \$7,500, to \$10,000.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOR] called attention to the fact that these men were the highest paid men in the employ of our Government. I want also to call attention to the fact that they are going out into a different field than that occupied now by any other department of our Government. They are going out in competition with the business world, and it is only fair to compare their salaries with the salaries of men employed by large financial institutions handling similar amounts of money and conducting as large a volume of business as the Federal Farm Loan Board will conduct. Every Senator on this floor realizes and knows that there is no man in the United States managing the affairs of a bank that conducts the amount of business that the Federal Farm Loan Board will conduct or having the responsibility that these men will have who does not receive from \$15,000 to \$50,000 a year. For that reason I believe that at this time it is only fair that we should at least give the members of the board a full year's time to demonstrate what they may be able to do without attempting to cut down their compensation before they have even had time to inaugurate the work to be done by the Farm Loan Board or to demonstrate their ability to perform the duties assigned them.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BRADY] lead me to make to him this suggestion, that in voting upon sustaining the ruling of the Chair we are not considering whether or not we will raise the salaries of the members of the Farm Loan Board back to \$10,000, as provided by the statute. That is a distinct and separate proposition, and the Rules of the Senate will allow us to express our will upon that proposition; in other words, the Senator does not have to vote against the ruling of the Chair in order to get an opportunity to vote to leave the salaries at \$10,000.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, I think the Senator must have misunderstood my remarks, as I intend to vote to sustain the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. BRYAN. Very well. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] also seemed to have the idea that the only way he could do justice to these men was to vote against the ruling of the Chair. I think the Senator in charge of the bill has already indicated that at the first opportunity—which is not now available because of the pendency of the point of order—he will move to increase the salaries of the members of the board to \$10,000 a year; but if he does not do so, any Senator in favor of that proposition can do so, and the Senate can express its real will with reference to the amount of salary which should be paid, and be free from any parliamentary complication when it does so.

Mr. President, one word further. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] expressed the opinion that perhaps the last paragraph of the committee amendment did contain general legislation because it had in it the words "annually thereafter."

In the first place, I do not believe that a mere requirement of an estimate to be made by a bureau should be considered general legislation; but, passing that by, I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that we are amending the text of the House provision. That provision has in it this language:

A detailed statement of expenditures hereunder shall be made to Congress.

We can go as far as we like upon that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It says "of expenditures hereunder."

Mr. BRYAN. We can go as far as we like in amending that language. We reproduce it, and then add this third paragraph. It seems to me, therefore, that, even under the most strained construction, the ruling of the Chair is correct.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I want to read from the statutes a general law that was passed on an appropriation bill:

That there shall be submitted hereafter in the annual Book of Estimates, following every estimate for a general or lump-sum appropriation, except public buildings or other public works constructed under contract, a statement showing in parallel columns:

First, the number of persons, if any, intended to be employed and the rates of compensation to each, and the amounts contemplated to be expended for each of any other objects or classes of expenditures specified or contemplated in the estimate, including a statement of estimated unit cost of any construction work proposed to be done; and

Second, the number of persons, if any, employed and the rate of compensation paid each, and the amounts expended for each other object or class of expenditure, and the actual unit cost of any construction work done, out of the appropriation corresponding to the estimate so submitted, during the completed fiscal year next preceding the period for which the estimate is submitted.

I wanted to put this in the RECORD not only to show that general legislation of this kind has been put on appropriation bills, but as showing that this is really carrying out what is provided by the general law.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, the committee put that in out of the abundance of caution.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. OVERMAN. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. What law did the Senator just read from?

Mr. OVERMAN. The sundry civil act of a certain date.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Was the point of order made against that provision?

Mr. OVERMAN. It was not. It is a law. It is general legislation on an appropriation bill. It became a law and is a general law that requires all departments to send estimates.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Unless the Senator can produce a ruling of the Presiding Officer showing that that point of order had been made against it and it had been ruled in order he is simply hoisting himself by his own boot straps.

Mr. OVERMAN. I simply wanted to get that in the RECORD to show not only that it had been done, but that every department must do it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not doubt that there have been violations of the law by putting general legislation on appropriation bills.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The position of the Senator from North Carolina, as I understand it, is that this is not general legislation; that it is a mere repetition of existing legislation. It changes no existing law. It changes nothing. It merely repeats what is now a general rule applicable to everybody.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, does the Senator claim that if there is some general legislation in existence and it is clapped onto an appropriation bill it ceases to be general legislation?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Oh, no. I do, however, claim that the provision contained in the third section of the committee amendment is not of any effect, because it is a mere repetition of a general law already of force.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, as I understand the provision read by the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, that was tacked onto the sundry civil act. This has nothing to do with the sundry civil act. Nothing that is provided by the sundry civil act can affect the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act.

Mr. OVERMAN. It is a general law on an appropriation bill.

Mr. SMOOT. No matter what the appropriation bill may be, if the words "annually hereafter" are used in an appropriation bill, it then becomes permanent law.

Mr. HOLLIS. The trouble is that it does not apply to the legislative, executive, and judicial bill; it applies only to the sundry civil bill.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; it may apply to all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. FLETCHER. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The ruling of the Chair was sustained.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I offer the following amendment to the committee amendment: On page 42, line 5, strike out the numerals "\$7,500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$10,000," so that it will read:

For four members of the board, at \$10,000 each—

And so forth; and I also move to change the totals on page 42.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course that will be done if the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. OVERMAN. The clerks have authority to change the totals.

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, the arguments in favor of this amendment have already been presented to the Senate so fully, in my judgment, that I am not justified in going into the matter now in great detail.

When the bill creating the Farm Loan Board was considered by the Senate a proposition was presented here to fix the salary of the members of the board at \$7,500 per annum. That amendment was discussed at great length, was fairly considered by the Senate, and the Senate finally determined to fix the salary at \$10,000. Upon the basis of that legislation the board has been organized and is proceeding with its work. The task is great and difficult. We are all interested in promoting the success of the rural-credits plan, and nothing should be done here which may have a contrary effect.

This is a critical time, in so far as the effectiveness of the farm-loan act is concerned. The manner in which the organization of the various banks provided for in the system is completed will determine in large part the success of this great measure or its failure. To reduce this salary now, after having determined that it shall be fixed at \$10,000 and after giving full consideration as to the amount of salary justified by the duties prescribed by the act, in my judgment, would tend to impair the successful operation of the law.

It has been urged by other Senators already that it might be regarded by the public as a reflection upon the existing members of the board. I feel sure that no one who supports an amendment to reduce this salary would base his argument upon that premise. Nevertheless it might be so regarded by the public. More than anything else in connection with the farm-loan measure, Congress is interested now in drawing to the organizations to be effected, or bringing to the organizations to be effected under the measure, the confidence of the public. If that end is not attained, the law will prove a failure. There may be some interests in this country which would rejoice to see that end accomplished. I know that no Representative in either branch of Congress would be actuated by a motive of that kind. I believe it is unfair and unwise in an appropriation bill, under the circumstances in which this amendment arises, to reduce this salary, and for that reason I have offered the amendment to restore it to \$10,000.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am in favor of paying each member of the Federal Farm Loan Board \$7,500 per annum. When the bill creating the board was under consideration, on May 1, 1916, I offered an amendment decreasing the salary provided for in the bill as reported to the Senate from \$10,000 to \$7,500. That motion carried by a vote of 26 to 25. The junior Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS], having the bill in charge, gave notice that when the bill reached the Senate he would ask for a separate vote upon that item. On May 4 that vote was taken, by way of reconsideration of it, and the salary was increased from the amount provided in the amendment offered by myself and agreed to by the Senate to \$10,000 per annum by a vote of 29 to 31, one Senator voting who was absent May 1 and one Senator changing his vote.

I do not think there will be any reflection upon any member of the board if this salary is reduced to \$7,500, nor am I going to take the time of the Senate now to repeat what I said when I offered the amendment to the bill creating the office providing a salary of \$7,500 for each member of the board; but I say now, without a question of doubt in my own mind, that there are many men in the employment of the Government of the United States who are doing and will do more work than the members of this board, and who are receiving but \$5,000 per annum.

I do not want to go into the details, but I want to say to the Senate that we are soon to consider in connection with this bill the question of an increase of the salaries of certain employees of the Government. I fully believe that if a proper investigation were made it would be found that there are enough employees of the Government receiving salaries greater than they are actually earning to take care of all of those who are receiving salaries less than they are rightfully earning.

Mr. President, a practice is becoming quite common among the departments of late that can result in only one thing, and that is an undue increase in the salaries of certain Government employees. I have a letter, in answer to my letter asking for certain information, from one of the bureaus of our Government showing that the Treasury Department, the Department of Labor, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Department of Agriculture, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Bureau of Fisheries within the last few weeks have taken from this bureau alone a number of employees of the Government, and, upon the initiative of the heads of these departments or bureaus, have increased their salaries from \$100 to \$600 per annum.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, since that letter was written I want to say that four men have been taken, and one man was taken who was receiving \$1,800 and transferred to one of these bureaus and given \$2,500, thus increasing his salary by transfer \$700.

Mr. SMOOT. And that has been done since the committee have passed upon this legislative bill and reported it to the Senate. I believe that some legislation must be passed in the near future to stop this kind of work. I want to say, however, in justification of the Farm Loan Board, that I do not know of the board taking from any of the other departments a single employee. While a couple of the members of the board were before the committee, without the information before me, I did bring up the question of transfers, thinking the Farm Loan Board had done the same thing; but I am only too glad to say that I know of no transfers of that kind that have been made by this board.

Mr. President, I want to say to the Senate that I have not the least feeling against a member of the Federal Farm Loan Board. I want the law to be a success. I voted for the law; and I know that it will be just as great a success with the members of the board drawing \$7,500—50 per cent more than heads of other great divisions and bureaus of our Government—as if they drew \$10,000. It is not going to make one particle of difference as to the result of the law. When the sundry civil appropriation bill comes before this body I want to see the salaries of the members of the Federal Trade Commission reduced. Take the Tariff Commission which was created by law a short time ago; by a vote of this body the salaries paid to the members of that commission were fixed at \$7,500. That is the amount that a Senator of the United States receives. That is more than the United States district judges receive. That is more than the head of any bureau or division within a department of the Government receives; and I do not believe that we ought to be extravagant in the appropriation of money for one commission or for one department or for one bureau unless we are extravagant in the appropriation of money for all the others.

There is never a time when the legislative appropriation bill is being considered by the Appropriations Committee but that representatives appear from nearly every department of this Government asking for increases. The consideration of this bill was no exception to the rule; and whenever there are salaries paid to a commission or to the employees of a commission that are greater than the salaries paid in the departments already established, and which have been in operation since the Government started, they point to the new salaries of the commission, and say: "We are not being treated rightly. We are being discriminated against." We shall never have a feeling of contentment among the employees of the Government as long as there is a discrimination made.

Mr. President, it is for the purpose of paying the employees of the Federal Farm Loan Bureau in conformity with the salaries paid employees in the other departments of the Government that this amendment has been recommended by the committee, and I do not believe it ought to be changed. In fact, Mr. President, the salaries fixed, in my opinion, are generally higher than the salaries in other departments that are required to do similar work.

I am not saying, nor would I have Senators understand me to believe, that there are not salaries that should be increased in all of the departments, even above \$1,000, many of them; but I want to say now that I know of employees in the Government departments who are receiving 50 per cent more than they can make anywhere else on earth, and they know it. I want to

say, also, that there are employees in the Government service who are not receiving half of what they can make outside of the employment of the Government.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. I think that is true. I think it is true in all instances where a large number of people are employed. I am in sympathy with the sentiment of the Senator from Utah; but I want to ask him if he thinks it is good legislation, or even fair legislation, to place in appropriation bills, for salaries of offices created by other acts of Congress, amounts which are below the amounts fixed in the acts creating those offices? Is it good legislation?

We pass to-day an act creating a bureau, providing certain members and fixing their salaries. The appointments are made in accordance with the law, and presumably the incumbents are entitled to the compensation which is found in the act creating the offices. Now, is it fair or right, in making appropriations to meet fixed expenditures of the Government, by indirection—for that is what it amounts to—to reduce the salaries by providing an amount which must be accepted if the incumbent remains in the office? And, of course, he takes his chances with the action of other Congresses thereafter with regard to securing the difference. Does not the Senator think that such a course of legislation, in addition to being unfair, will only result in the applications and the increasing applications of those so treated to subsequent Congresses for appropriations for their reimbursement to the extent provided by the law of their creation, because this does not repeal the other law? It remains just where it was before. We ignore it, virtually.

It seems to me we ignore our own duty when we fail to meet its requirements, instead of amending the law itself so as to fix a salary at a sum commensurate with what we think it ought to be.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that I think it is perfectly fair for the Committee on Appropriations, in considering the amount of salaries paid, to reduce a salary where it is so manifestly inconsistent with the salaries paid to employees in other departments. I also believe that if the Senate of the United States becomes convinced that any law fixed a salary at a sum greater than was justified, or if the salary is greater than the conditions would justify, then I think it is the duty of the Committee on Appropriations to reduce that salary.

The salaries of the members of this board will not be reduced until the 1st day of July of this year. The bill that passed last year provides for that; so they have ample notice, just the same as any other employer ought to give notice to an employee, that for the year beginning on July 1, 1917, the salary of this office will be \$7,500 per year.

Mr. THOMAS. Then, the Senator would substitute for the action of Congress the opinion of one of the committees of one of the Houses?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no; I would not do that, because it has to be finally passed upon by the Senate itself.

I will say to the Senator that the very amendment which is being considered now, as far as it affects the salaries paid to the members of the board, was agreed to by this body. It took three days, however, to secure two more votes to override and reconsider the vote. But even as it passed the Senate one additional vote would have defeated it; and now, if the majority of the Members of the Senate of the United States feel that in justice to all other employees of the Government the salary ought to be \$7,500, I can not see any inconsistency in reducing the salary.

Mr. THOMAS. Of course, the Senator knows that the amount of the majority by which a bill passes has but very little, if anything, to do with the question. I presume that pretty nearly every measure enacted in the next House of Representatives will have a slender majority one way or the other.

The Senator said a few minutes ago, I presume in justification of his position, that there were many officials of the Government occupying humbler positions and receiving smaller salaries who were actually earning more than the members of this board. I think that is true; but is it not also true, or may it not be true, with regard to some members of the Cabinet? If so, would not the same reasoning justify the Committee on Appropriations in reporting salaries of \$7,500 for such members of the Cabinet, whose salaries are now fixed, I think, at \$12,000 a year? Why should it not be done, as a matter of justice, in the one case as well as in the other?

Mr. SMOOT. There would be a discrimination in that case between members of the Cabinet.

Mr. THOMAS. Well, take the President of the United States. It might be considered that some one is doing more work than he is, and receiving less compensation.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no discrimination here, because every member of the board is paid the same salary that every other member receives.

Mr. THOMAS. I thank the Senator for allowing me to interrupt him.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. VARDAMAN. The Senator from Utah stated a moment ago that he thought it was well within the province of the committee to reduce a salary when it was disproportionate or not in accord with other salaries. I think that in that he is absolutely correct and that the committee would be warranted in recommending to the Congress a reduction of a salary if anything to justify it had occurred between the time that the Congress first fixed the salary and the time that the committee was making an appropriation to pay the salary.

The question that we are considering now was thoroughly considered by the Congress. It was a matter that engaged the attention of the Senate for several days, and the Senate finally reached the conclusion, against my protest and over my vote, that \$10,000 was the proper salary to pay to these officers. Now, nothing has transpired since that act of this particular Senate to change the character, the nature, the scope, or the work of the board; and I do not see where the committee obtained information that led them to consider that the Congress would change its mind about this matter at this time. Appropriations committees, as I understand, are for the purpose of appropriating money to meet the expenses of the Government as they are prescribed by law, not to legislate; and I submit to the Senator that nothing has transpired since the exhaustive discussion of this question to justify the Congress in changing its opinion as to what the salary ought to be.

Mr. SMOOT. I will remind the Senator that there has been something that has transpired that, at least, led me to believe that there was a change in the attitude of the Senate. There was reported to the Senate a bill creating a tariff commission, providing a salary of \$10,000 per annum for each member of the commission. After an exhaustive discussion of the amount to be paid to the members of that commission—I believe it was on motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]—the amount was reduced to \$7,500. During that discussion the question of the amount that was being paid to the members of the Federal Farm Loan Board, to the members of the Federal Trade Commission, and to the other commissions was discussed, and it was freely stated by Senators that they thought the salaries paid the members of those commissions were too high.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I am one of the Senators who voted to fix the salary at \$7,500, but there was nothing said by the majority of the Senators who voted to give the members of the Farm Loan Board \$10,000 which would justify the Senator from Utah in concluding that they had changed their minds about it. I think it ought to have been \$7,500, as I have heretofore stated; but it was not done, but the salary was fixed at \$10,000, and I believe it is unfair and unjust for Congress now to refuse to pay it.

Mr. SMOOT. I know the Senator voted that the salary of the members of the board should be \$7,500. I took time to look up the vote, and it was not a party vote. Senators on both sides of the Chamber voted for an increase to \$10,000, and Senators on both sides of the Chamber voted against it.

Mr. President, I wish to say that it was not the unanimous vote of the committee, but a majority of the committee, that these salaries should be fixed at \$7,500.

Mr. BRYAN. The Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. SMOOT. The Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BRYAN. It was carried by a majority of 1 or 2.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply wanted to show that.

Mr. BRYAN. The subcommittee decided to leave it at \$10,000, but the full committee reduced it to \$7,500.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Will the Senator from Utah permit an interruption?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I call the attention of the Senator from Utah to the long custom in both Houses of reducing salaries whenever both Houses see fit to do it. We know that for a great many years the governors of the Territories got \$3,500 a year by an unrevoked law, and for 20 years in my experience the Appropriations Committee of either House never did give them more than \$3,000, and they always stated in the bill that

it should be considered in full of any claim that the person had against the Government. The result was that the two Houses, acting on the advice of the Committees on Appropriations, kept the salary down with an open law standing in their face, and that was the common practice of both Houses for 25 years. So, on the mere question of the reduction of salary, that can be done at any time by the two Houses whenever they get ready to do it. The party is left either to hold the office or resign, as he sees fit.

Mr. SMOOT. The statement made by the Senator from Arizona is absolutely correct. I know there was an effort made to bring suit against the Government of the United States to recover the amount unpaid, but it fell by the wayside and was never heard of but once.

It seems to me that the only excuse which could possibly be offered to vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas, increasing the salary from \$7,500 to \$10,000, is that within a year Congress voted that their salaries should be \$10,000. In my opinion, if you are going to deal justly with the other employees of the Government, we ought to decrease their salary from \$10,000 to \$7,500.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, it seems to me the position of the Senator from Utah is rather remarkable. The claim he makes is that some people are getting more than they ought to get and others are getting less. I am in favor of raising the salary of those who ought to get more, and I would change the law in that respect.

But the Senator does not seem to be impressed with the idea that when the law has settled the question of the compensation of members of this board we ought to pay any attention to that law, and we ought to be governed by it. He makes the suggestion that we are increasing these salaries from \$7,500 to \$10,000. That is not the situation at all. The effort here is to decrease by indirection, not directly, the compensation fixed by Congress for the members of this board. Every member of the board took the responsibilities and duties of the office with the statute before them that they were to receive a salary of \$10,000 per annum. Now, the committee proposes that after that contract has been entered into under the law to evade the contract indirectly by providing that the appropriations shall be only \$7,500 each, and not according to the law \$10,000 each.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. JONES. The Senator does not claim that we could not pass legislation reducing the salary to even \$5,000 if we saw fit.

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly, I do not claim that Congress could not do it.

Mr. JONES. Without violating any contract with these people?

Mr. FLETCHER. But Congress can only do it by an act for that purpose by general legislation. It can not do it on an appropriation bill. That is the reason why the rule is made. It is to prevent a general appropriation bill from carrying general legislation which would repeal a general statute upon a general subject.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. Is it not true that upon an appropriation bill the salary of Representatives and Senators was increased, and if an increase can be made on an appropriation bill why can not a decrease be made?

Mr. FLETCHER. If there was any increase of salaries carried upon an appropriation bill, it would have been subject to a point of order, had the point of order been raised against it, under our rule.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President—

Mr. FLETCHER. That question has been settled, and I will not go into it further. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BRADY. Let me ask the Senator if he can call to mind any instance where the salary of a Senator or Representative in Congress has been decreased?

Mr. FLETCHER. I think there is no instance of that sort.

Mr. SMOOT. Does the Senator claim that when on the legislative appropriation bill the salary of the President was increased that that item could have gone out on a point of order?

Mr. FLETCHER. No; not on a point of order. That is not the question. If the law fixed the salary at a given figure, and an attempt was made to change it upon a general appropriation bill, I think it would have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. SMOOT. That is done very, very often.

Mr. FLETCHER. It may be done, but it is in violation of the rule, in my judgment.

Mr. President, aside from that, for we have wasted five times as much time on it as we have any business to waste, we get right down to the proposition that the only reason why the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas should be favored is because the statute fixed the compensation at \$10,000, not because the work of the board or the importance or significance of it justifies it. I contend just the contrary. Here is an act passed establishing a financial system which is altogether new in this country. We have been for 50 years confined to the only financial system we had under the national banking act of 1864, which was a commercial system, pure and simple, and it not only did not meet the needs of agriculture but discriminated against agriculture, because written into the very body of the law was a prohibition against accepting real estate as a security for loans. Real estate, the farmer's chief asset, was stricken down as security for a loan under the only financial system we had in operation in this country. We reached out to discover a means, a method and a way whereby proper, reasonable, just, and fair accommodation financially might be extended to those engaged in agriculture in this country. There was admitted need of it. The experience of the older countries in Europe had demonstrated that they had to come to it and that it was a wise and a just and a proper thing to do. We thereupon began to study the subject and devised this scheme, and the system has been established under the law.

It is a new thing. It had to be put into operation. You can not pick up any man and put him in that position and have him organize, as it should be organized, and put into operation, as it should be put into operation, this broad and wise system which we have provided for under the law. You must have men of judgment, men of capacity, men of experience, men who understand the agricultural needs of the country, men who know how to accomplish the relief intended to be accomplished by the act.

We are not paying these men one cent more than they are worth. It would be absurd and ridiculous to expect any man capable of discharging the responsible duties of that position to give his whole time and attention and his skill and his efforts to it upon a meager compensation of \$5,000 or \$6,000. No man could afford to do it without great sacrifice. No man ought to undertake that work who is not in a position to give it his entire time, and especially is that true at the very inception of the organization.

The success of the system is going to depend largely upon the wisdom and the energies of this board. The success of the system will inevitably, to a very great extent, depend upon the way in which they organize it and put it into operation. They have given their time to it; they have given their attention to it; they are performing those duties faithfully and industriously, and I think, so far as I have ever heard, so far as I know or have observed, efficiently and properly. They deserve it; their work justifies it; their character and their ability call for this amount of compensation. It is not one cent more than they are entitled to receive.

There is a proposition in this amendment also to make the salary of the secretary of the board \$3,000. The gentleman who is now serving as secretary of that board is not merely an amanuensis. He does not merely keep the records and the files and the documents that are submitted to the board; he is an expert. He understands this law; he has studied it from its beginning; he has had to do with it in his work as clerk to the joint committee which thrashed it out; he knows it from beginning to end; he knows the purposes of Congress in enacting the law. His heart and soul are in the work. He desires it to succeed. He understands what we have been driving at in establishing this system. He realizes its importance. His advice, his counsel, his services are valuable to the board not merely as an ordinary secretary to a committee or something of that sort but because he is a man of capacity. He is thoroughly equipped as a banker. He thoroughly understands also the needs of the farmers of the country. He appreciates the difficulties in establishing this system, and he is faithfully assisting in working out a plan and a program under which will be accomplished what it has been the hope of the friends of the measure would be accomplished under it.

So I say such a man is worth more than any \$3,000 per annum. He could not afford to give his time and attention and his services to this or any other work wholly and entirely as he will have to do for a compensation so meager and insignificant as that.

You do not want cheap men in positions of great responsibility where a measure of vast, tremendous consequences, capable of inestimable benefit and value to the people who produce the food of the Nation is to be worked out.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. FLETCHER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WEEKS. I ask the Senator what the secretary was doing before he was employed in his present position?

Mr. FLETCHER. I have not inquired as to that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I can tell the Senator something on that point. He was something like a year or more employed as an expert to assist the joint committee of the two Houses in framing the law.

Mr. WEEKS. What was he doing before that time?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not able to answer.

Mr. FLETCHER. I presumed the Senator's question had reference to that, because he undoubtedly knows the present secretary of the board was occupied in connection with the framing of legislation as clerk to the joint committee which had the subject under consideration.

Mr. WEEKS. I understood that.

Mr. FLETCHER. Prior to that time I am not advised. At one time in his career he was president of a national bank in the city of New York. I do not know what business he was engaged in subsequent to that time.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. FLETCHER. Certainly.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. If the Senator will permit me, I think I can answer the question of the Senator from Massachusetts. I have known the secretary, Mr. Flannagan, for a good many years. He is a gentleman of infinite ability and very high repute in the State of New Jersey. He was, when I first knew him, a banker; after that the acting president of a very prominent bank in New York, and latterly, as has been stated, the secretary of the joint committee. He is a high order of gentleman, a man of capabilities, an honor to the position he holds, and a credit to all those around him. I think he is richly worth \$6,000 in the capacity in which he is serving.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator from New Jersey seems to know about the secretary's past history. Did he ever receive \$6,000 in any position he occupied?

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I can not respond as to what pecuniary returns he may have received, but I know he is a gentleman of standing, and I think the Senator as a banker, if he knew as I know his high ability and his standing, would hardly question that he was overpaid at \$6,000 in this capacity.

Mr. WEEKS. The indorsement which the Senator from New Jersey gives will have great influence in deciding my course, but I wished to know what the past history of the man had been, if I could.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. He is a gentleman of a very high order.

Mr. FLETCHER. I did not expect in this matter to make any personal references; but, speaking of Mr. Flannagan, I do not think the question of \$5,000 or \$6,000 a year is a particularly tempting proposition to him. I think he prizes the importance of the system and desires to see it succeed, and is willing to contribute largely his best efforts toward its ultimate success, and the salary perhaps is not a matter that influences him very greatly one way or the other. At the same time, I am dealing with it from the standpoint of what is just and fair and right and independent of any question as to who holds the position now. The question is as to the duties and responsibilities of the office itself. Mr. President, I am not going to detain the Senate longer in discussing this matter. If the Farm Loan Board wants some one in that position who merely does the loose and ordinary work of a stenographer, a typewriter, or a secretary in the usual sense of the word, that is another thing. The secretary of this board does something more than that. The position is one that calls for work of a very much higher grade than that ordinarily performed by what we usually designate a secretary. I instanced the present occupant of that position by way of indicating that the position is one of great responsibility and was so considered when the board selected Mr. Flannagan to fill it. Of course, the question of compensation of the secretary is not now before us, but while I was up I thought I would refer to it, because if some one does not offer an amendment to increase the amount named in the proposed amendment of the committee, I shall do so myself.

Mr. BRADY. Mr. President, I fear we are wandering rather far afield from the discussion of the amendment before the Senate. We are now considering simply the salary of members of the Farm Loan Board. I am in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas, Mr. ROBINSON. While I am just as much in favor of practicing economy as any Member of this body, I do not believe that this is a proper place to commence. The tendency for the last year has been rather to increase than to decrease salaries, for the reason that the cost of living has increased so materially in the last few years.

These men accepted the position under a law that we recently passed, naming their salary at \$10,000 a year, after full discussion by this body. They left their vocations, moved to Washington in the faith and belief that they had made a satisfactory contract with a responsible Government. It has been suggested that the present salary will continue until July 1, 1917, and that the members of the board have ample notice that \$7,500 is the salary that will be paid to them after that date. It seems to me that the defeat of this amendment is notice from this body that we have changed our minds since passing the act, and have decided that their services are not worth \$10,000 a year and we proceed to cut their salaries down without consulting them or even giving them any notice of our intention.

I do not believe it is fair to them. I do not believe it is fair to the country to take such action. We may differ as to the value of this farm loan bank; we may differ as to the methods of handling the matter by the board, but none of us differ as to our hopes for good results from this institution. We can not secure them, in my judgment, by commencing to lower the salaries of these men before they have had an opportunity to demonstrate what they can do.

I can not see the force of the argument in comparing what has been done in other bureaus or departments by citing cases where salaries have been raised or transfers have been made from one department to another for the purpose of increasing the salary of an employee, for the reason that by our action to-day in sustaining the ruling of the Chair we decided that we would not have this appropriation administered in a lump sum, but that we would name the salary, thus correcting that which we are complaining of in the departments; that is to say, we are correcting the very fault in the departments by fixing these salaries ourselves.

The only question at the present time before the body is whether this salary should be increased to \$10,000 or permitted to remain at \$7,500, as named by the committee. It does not matter what our vote was when the act was passed. It does not matter whether we favored \$10,000 or \$7,500 at that time. At this moment it is a question of pure, simple, business methods. This bureau is different from other departments of the Government. It is a business undertaking and should be handled along business lines. While we are discussing the question of economy we should also at the same time discuss the question of good business methods. I do not believe it would be good business for us at this time to change this particular salary. These men have their work well in hand. They have organized 12 different districts. They have applications on their desks not only for hundreds of thousands but for millions of dollars in loans. All that must be passed upon this coming year. At the present moment, with conditions as they are, I think it is not only fair but that it is the duty of the Senate to support the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas and name the amount at \$10,000 instead of \$7,500. Let us keep faith with these men, and let us give the agricultural interests of the country with their bank an equal chance with the Federal reserve bank, which we so recently created.

Mr. CHILTON. Mr. President, I have not been in the Senate during the whole of this discussion, and the thought which is in my mind about this subject may have been expressed by others while I was out of the Chamber. If that shall be the case, I can console myself with remembering that it is not the first time that there have been some repetitions of arguments upon this floor, and I will take the chance to say to the Senate what I think about this amendment.

Mr. President, this argument was gone into very fully when we passed the Federal farm-loan bill. The advocates of the \$10,000 salary, and also of the lower salary, were heard, and the deliberate judgment of the Senate, of the House of Representatives, and of the President, by his ratification, was that the character of the employment, the character of the duties to be discharged by the members of the board, and the fact that we were putting into execution a new department of the Government, justified the Senate and the House of Representatives in voting for the \$10,000 salary. We discussed the possibility of

getting the kind of men whom we had in mind as the men who should inaugurate this system, and whether or not there was a possibility or a probability of getting the kind of men that we had in mind at a salary of less than \$10,000; and it was the deliberate judgment of the Senate that it would require the greater salary in order to induce that kind of men to accept these appointments. So we went forward and we fixed their terms—one of them at two years, one of them at four years, one of them at six years, and one of them at eight years. The President made his selections. These men accepted these positions with the understanding—not a legal contract, but with the honorable understanding on the part of the Government—that one of them should have \$10,000 for two years, another \$10,000 for four years, another \$10,000 for six years, and another \$10,000 for eight years.

I will admit that that is not a binding contract upon the Government or upon the Senate, and yet it is in a way binding upon honorable men. If we now change that salary, we must march up to the proposition that we either are intending to make an assault upon this system or else that we have some criticism as to the appointments which have been made by the President, or some criticism of the men who are discharging the duties of the office.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEWIS in the chair). Does the Senator from West Virginia yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. CHILTON. I do.

Mr. THOMAS. Let me ask the Senator if he does not consider that the understanding is binding to this effect: That if we propose to make a change in these salaries, we should do it by amending the law creating the board instead of by this indirect method of starving the commission, so to speak, partially at least, by a meager appropriation?

Mr. CHILTON. I thank the Senator from Colorado. That is the very thought that was in my mind.

Now, Mr. President, these gentlemen have started in to inaugurate this great system, one that the people have been calling upon us to put into operation, one that the great farming interests feel should have been put into operation years ago, and feel that our failure to do so has been a neglect upon the part of this great Government. We have selected from different walks of life four men, all of whom stand high. They have been successful in private life; they have been money-makers; they are men who have given up their private employment; they have accepted these positions—one of them for two years, another for four years, another for six years, and another for eight years, respectively. They are starting in to put the system into operation, and at the first succeeding session of Congress we are now asked not only to amend that act of Congress—a deliberate act of Congress—but we are asked indirectly to either assault this system or indirectly to criticize the men who are holding the positions, and to put them in the unfortunate position of having to go back to private life or to accept the salary, which in all probability they would not have accepted but for the understanding which our act held out to them would be the salary for the term for which they were appointed.

Mr. VARDAMAN. And to accept it under the terms under which they would be required to accept it would be rather discreditable to them.

Mr. CHILTON. It would be so.

Mr. President, this is not right; it is not the way to legislate; it is not fair to these gentlemen. It puts them in an embarrassing position in which we should not put them; and I do hope that the Senate will not legislate in this way, but that we shall keep these salaries at \$10,000 per annum.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I was not in sympathy with the point of order which was made against the committee's amendment, for I believe that we ought to have at all times the right and the power to fix the salaries of the persons who labor for the Government. I am, however, in favor of the House provision, and I sincerely hope that the entire Senate amendment will be rejected.

There is no such thing as a standard for reasonable compensation. We pay the President of the United States \$75,000 a year. Why? We could undoubtedly secure candidates for that high office if the compensation were but a tithe of the amount the law now provides. We pay the President \$75,000 a year largely because that amount is fairly necessary to enable him to discharge with dignity the duties of his exalted office, believing at the same time we shall secure men of the highest competency and the purest patriotism.

Not very long ago we organized a Federal Reserve Board. We passed a law which provided that each member of that

board should receive \$12,000 per annum. That could not be measured by any mathematical standard. In my judgment, the duties to be performed by the members of the Federal Farm Loan Board are more important and will require, if successfully performed, a higher degree of capacity than is required of the members of the Federal Reserve Board. The one is a bankers' institution—and I do not use that term disparagingly at all—but the path is reasonably plain, the learning for the creation of the system was at hand. That is not true of the Federal Farm Loan Board. As the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] has said, we are beginning an experiment. I believe it will be successful; but whether it is or is not, will depend very largely upon the character and the attainments and the fidelity of the men who compose the board during the first two or three years of its work.

That board has now divided the country into 12 districts; it is now engaged in organizing 12 farm-loan banks. It must select the presidents of those banks, it must select the directors of those banks, it must give color and complexion to those banks, and their work will in large measure determine whether these farm-loan banks that are to be established throughout the country do their business in such a way as to commend the system to the people of the country or to condemn it in the minds of the people of the country.

I think the one danger before the Federal Farm Loan Board will be its disposition, or a temptation rather than a disposition, to loan too much money upon a given tract of land. If it shall happen that the Federal Farm Loan Board shall encourage or permit the Federal farm-loan banks to loan more money upon a given tract of land than ought to be loaned, we shall soon usher in a period of insolvency, a period of foreclosure; and that is but a synonym for a period of failure of this institution, for which so much is hoped, and which I believe can be of as much value to the people of this country as any commission or board or tribunal which we have organized in many years.

Something has been said about the men who have been appointed to these positions. I do not know how much they earned before they were so appointed, but I am very intimately acquainted with two members of this board. They are, of course, men of the highest character; they are men who have succeeded in life; who were not lifted out of obscurity in order to be given a place upon this board, but who had established their title to the confidence of the country long before they were selected. They are men of the highest competency as well; they are students; men who have explored deeply and thoroughly the problems which are connected with this new and, I hope, successful undertaking on the part of the Government.

If anyone should ask me, I do not know what is a reasonable compensation for such service and such men. I could not reduce my answer to the inquiry to anything like a mathematical precision, but it is folly to assert that they are not of as much value to their countrymen as are the members of the Federal Reserve Board; and I am not touching or even suggesting a doubt with regard to the propriety of the rate of their compensation. I know of hundreds of men in private life, who are not better qualified than are these two men, who are earning five times as much in the pursuits of civil industry. I know a great many men, on the other hand, who may be just as competent, who are earning less than \$10,000 per year. You can not reduce the question to anything like a standard that would be accepted by everybody.

I think it would be in the highest degree unfortunate if in the very formative period, the critical moment, of this undertaking, we were to declare that the salaries which we established in the passage of the law were too high and that they should be reduced. The inference that the particular men selected for the places do not measure up to the proper standard would be inevitable. We established a salary of \$10,000 a year for men in those positions believing that to be, as far as we could understand, a fair compensation. The men have been appointed; they are at work. Should we reduce their salary to \$7,500 per year, I do not see how it would be possible to avoid the implication that we believe that the President has not selected for these offices men of the type we had in mind when we established the offices.

So much for the salaries of the members of the board. I, however, have a graver objection to the remainder of this amendment than to the mere compensation of the members of the board itself.

It may be recalled that when the Federal farm-loan act was passed I was vigorously opposed, as I am now, to withdrawing the employees of the board from the operation of the civil-service law of the country. I think, with the exception of those confidential employees who occupy peculiar relations to the head

of the enterprise, they ought to have been chosen according to the law of the land, which, while it now and then falls of perfection in its operations, yet, on the whole, is the best system for the ascertainment of merit that we have been able to devise; and I do not want anything that I say now to be understood as approving that departure in the passage of the original law; but I do believe—I believed then and I believe now—that the board ought to be given discretion in the selection of its employees—I mean the determination of the number of employees who may be necessary to carry on its work; I mean the classification of those employees and a discretion with regard to the bureaus, if you please, that should be organized in the Federal Farm Loan Board. The members of this board do not know and can not know; the Members of Congress do not know and can not know just how many employees are necessary or just what their final fixed titles will be in the service.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that the classification of these employees in this amendment is exactly as proposed by the members of the board themselves, and it is only with regard to the amount of salary that the amendment differs from the estimates or recommendations of the board.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator from Pennsylvania is technically right, but he does not state the whole fact, as I understand it. They have selected certain employees, or, at least, they have established certain classes or classification, but they are purely tentative. I believe that the members of the board told the Appropriations Committee that they might desire within a year to change these very matters; that they could only determine by actual experience when the work had been fairly set on foot just what employees were desirable and just what those employees should be termed in the language of the service.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that the members of the board who appeared before the committee informed the committee that the employees provided for in the first paragraph of the Senate committee amendment would be essential and would be always needed by the board. The second paragraph provides for salaries and expenditures under the Federal loan act, and \$250,000 is appropriated for that purpose. It is true that the members of the board stated they did not know how many employees they would require within the next year; but the bill provides something like \$187,000 to take care of the extra help that may be required and the expenditures that may be incurred during the year. I will say to the Senator also, that if the board had had more permanent employees, we would have included them in paragraph 1, the same as we do for employees in every other department.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to do that eventually. I agreed with those who discussed the matter this morning that we can not to any bureau or department permanently delegate the authority to employ persons in an unlimited way or to fix their salaries. I have no difference of opinion with you gentlemen about that; but I am only insisting that the board has just begun its work; its important work is yet to come. It is not organized, so far as the work in Washington goes. I am saying this on account of representations made to me by the members of the board. They are feeling their way to an efficient organization, trying to ascertain just what work will be required to be done in Washington and what kind of men will be required to do it. Now, I think in all fairness we ought to give the board this discretion this year. I am not saying that a year hence, assuming then that the work of organization is complete, that we ought not to determine what employees shall remain in the service and what their compensation shall be; but this is not, in my judgment, the time to do that thing.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. OVERMAN. I do not exactly understand the Senator. The positions and the salaries attached to them as fixed in the bill are the same as fixed and determined by the board. In addition to that, we have given them more money than they had before, namely, \$250,000, for the purpose of allowing them to select such officers as they think ought to be appointed and to fix their salaries. All that we require them to do is when they have created the places and fixed the salaries to send to us the names and the amounts and the designation of the offices.

Under this \$250,000 appropriation they can appoint and will appoint lawyers, for instance, and fix their salaries. They will appoint clerks and fix their salaries, whether clerks of class 2, class 3, class 4, or class 5; or they may not classify them, just as they please. Under this lump sum of money which we have given them they can appoint as many officers as they please and fix their salaries. But, having appointed certain men and fixed their salaries, we thought it was our duty to fix the salaries of the few men they have appointed according to the standard of wages applied in other departments for the same class of work.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I do not intend to be led into a discussion with regard to the proper salary for a secretary or a proper salary for the chief of the bond division. I do not know what a proper salary would be for such officers. As I said a while ago, there is no standard for work of that character. All that I am insisting upon is that for this year, until the organization is complete, the board shall be given the liberty, the discretion, which it had under the act which created it and which is preserved in the House bill.

Mr. OVERMAN. Does the Senator think that they have not that discretion under the Senate committee amendment?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not think so. If so, why was the amendment suggested?

Mr. OVERMAN. We suggested the amendment to fix the salaries of those whom the board have already appointed, not intending to limit them at all in any way whatever in fixing the salaries of other employees. That is what the lump sum of \$250,000 is for.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have been told—I do not know whether it be accurate—that up to this time they have employed merely stenographers.

Mr. OVERMAN. That is correct.

Mr. CUMMINS. And they have been simply trying to answer the 1,500 or 2,000 letters a day which have been coming to the board. They expect that they will have a man at the head of the bond division, but they do not know. They gave the committee that tentative opinion.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; they have appointed a man for that position.

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, they do not know that he is the man whom they will ultimately desire or that the title of the place will be a permanent or a fixed one.

Mr. OVERMAN. There is nothing to prevent them under this amendment from appointing another bondman or calling him anything they please and giving him \$5,000 if they so desire.

Mr. CUMMINS. There is possibly nothing in the amendment that would prevent that, but of course the Senator from North Carolina knows that it would be impossible—that is, they would not do it.

Mr. OVERMAN. I think they are very honorable men and will do the proper thing, but if the man was worth it and was the right sort of a man the salary they fixed would probably not be questioned, although it might not suit me.

Mr. CUMMINS. All that I am asking is that they be given a fair show until the organization is complete.

Mr. SMOOT. I should have said a while ago that we give the board \$250,000, all told.

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course, the committee does not give them \$250,000 in addition to the salaries of the men specifically provided for.

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. CUMMINS. The House gave \$300,000. Whether that is right, whether it is too much or too little, I do not know. I would not venture an opinion as to that; but I am quite willing to accept the view of the Senate committee that \$250,000 in all may be sufficient.

Mr. OVERMAN. Now, Mr. President, I want to read the paragraph in the committee amendment providing the lump sum for salaries and expenses. I will not read it all, but it includes:

And such salaries, fees, and expenses as are authorized by said act, including farm-loan registrars, examiners, and such attorneys, experts, assistants, clerks, laborers, and other employees as the Farm Loan Board may find necessary, \$182,380; in all, \$250,000.

That shows that they have been given this amount to appoint such officers as they desire. We had that question up with them, and, as the Senator has said, they did not know who they were going to appoint. They have only thus far appointed a few stenographers to answer letters. These stenographers, for example, are paid \$1,200 per annum. We fixed the salaries of such employees at about the same rate that stenographers are getting in other departments.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, the very fact that the committee found it necessary to make a bulk appropriation of \$182,380 indicates that the work of the board is yet incomplete, so far as organization is concerned. I have founded my entire argument upon a sincere belief that it would be infinitely better to permit the board, during this period of preparation for its real work, to enjoy the discretion and the liberty given to it in the original act. I have such implicit confidence in the fidelity of the members of the board and their desire to render an unselfish service to the people of this country that I am not plagued a moment with any fear that one penny of the appropriation will be misspent or inefficiently spent.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I desire to say just a word with regard to this matter, which involves, as I understand, the question of the salaries of the members of the Farm Loan Board.

I am not in favor of reducing the salaries of this board and leaving at as the sole accomplishment of the Congress, but I am opposed to these high salaries. I voted for a salary of \$7,500 when the bill was pending for the creation of this board. I felt then that that was sufficient, and I feel now that it is sufficient. I should dislike, however, to see this particular board singled out and the salaries reduced, and have certain other commissions which have been created retain their salaries. I think this is a very important board, and of course it ought to be treated upon a par with all others; but I think all these salaries are too high. Having voted for the salary of \$7,500 when the bill was before us, my vote can in no sense be regarded as a reflection upon the gentlemen now constituting the board. It is simply my deliberate judgment as to what the salary should be.

It seems to me that it is a rather serious condition that confronts us in this country. We have, in the first place, our municipal officers; we have our county officers; we have our State officers and our Federal officers, layer upon layer of officers; and if the salaries are to be increased, as we are disposed to increase them in these days, the expenses of the Government will become almost unendurable.

Under a form of government such as ours men must necessarily enter the service contributing something in the way of service over and above that for which they are actually compensated. If we can not have a performance of public service on any other basis than that of actual compensation, the same as a man employed by a corporation would expect, we are going to be confronted with a budget for the year's running expenses of the Government which will be something simply stupendous. The best service in the world is the service of the man who understands perfectly that he is contributing something over and above that for which he is actually compensated. He must be willing to serve the public as well as himself.

I shall vote, therefore, to reduce these salaries, and I shall hope to have an opportunity to do the same thing with at least two, if not three, other commissions before this session closes. I am not unfriendly to this law, although I entertain no doubt the law will have to be radically and fundamentally changed before it will be of service to that class of farmers which needs it most. But while not unfriendly to the principle of the law or to the board, I am most earnestly against all these high salaries.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, when the farm-loan bill was up I voted for the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah fixing the salary of its members at \$7,500. I am not here this afternoon to discuss the question of salary. It does seem to me that this amendment, as reported by the Senate committee, has other features in it which will do the board more harm than the reduction in the salaries of the members of the board.

As I understand it, this board asked for \$400,000 to carry on their work. They were heard in full by the members of the House Committee on Appropriations, and the bill came to this body carrying \$300,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to correct that statement. The estimate was not \$400,000, but \$300,000.

Mr. CURTIS. I stated that they asked for \$400,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. No; the Senator is mistaken. They estimated for \$300,000.

Mr. CURTIS. I read the following from the hearings before the House Committee on Appropriations:

There was allowed in the farm-loan act the sum of \$100,000, and also, by way of a deficiency appropriation, an additional \$100,000, making \$200,000 in all for the current year for the administration of the farm-loan act. You are asking for the next fiscal year the sum of \$400,000.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I see that I was mistaken about that. The House gave \$300,000.

Mr. CURTIS. So they asked for \$400,000. After complete hearings, the bill comes to the Senate giving them \$300,000, and

the Senate reduces the amount to \$250,000. That is a reduction of \$150,000 below the amount they asked.

I do not believe any bill should be passed by the Congress that would interfere with the work of this board, and I think the reduction of the amount asked will do more harm than the simple reduction in the salary. I think this board should have more money with which to carry on its work.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. As I understand, one member of the board who appeared before the committee was asked whether he thought that in the present condition of the Treasury of the United States the appropriation of \$250,000 would be sufficient for them to get along on, with the strictest economy. He answered the committee and said that he thought that it would; and that is why the amount was reduced from \$300,000 to \$250,000.

Mr. CURTIS. I examined the hearings before the Senate committee, and I saw nothing on this subject, and that is why I referred to the matter. Of course, if a member of the board informed the committee that \$250,000 would be sufficient, I would not insist upon a larger amount.

Mr. OVERMAN. The Senator is on the committee, and I want to explain how that happened. He was absent at the time.

Mr. CURTIS. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. OVERMAN. We gave hearings day after day to everybody who wanted to be heard, as we usually do. The Senator, being a member of the committee, knows how that is. After we had given all the hearings, and everybody had been heard, some two weeks afterwards—we had two weeks of hearings—when we came to mark up the bill, as we usually do, we found this Farm Loan Board in a separate section; and, as we usually do, we sent for them to know who was employed and how much they needed, and so on. They said they would like to be heard and they came down—Mr. NORRIS and Mr. SMITH, I think—and we went over the whole matter with them. My recollection is that the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] took up with them the question of the lump sum and the question of these salaries, and went into the subject thoroughly with the members of the board themselves. We did not have a stenographer present that morning, because the hearings had closed, and the volume of hearings had been printed.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I do not question, of course, the statement of either of the Senators. I know they state what is so on this question. I read the hearings and found nothing on the subject, and therefore I supposed that the committee had acted without giving the members of the board full opportunity to be heard. They had asked for \$400,000 from Congress, and had received \$300,000, and then there was a further reduction to \$250,000. Of course, if the board is satisfied with it, I know I am; but I should hate to see the appropriation so reduced as to hamper the work of the board.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, as I understand, the motion that is now before the Senate is the amendment offered by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON], and that is to restore the amount fixed by law for the salary of the members of the Federal Farm Loan Board, but to leave the salaries of the employees of the board as they are fixed by the committee.

I am in favor of that amendment. After the consideration which was given to the matter when the Federal farm-loan bill was discussed and acted upon in this body, and the amount fixed at \$10,000 per year, I do not believe it should be changed. These men have been appointed to those positions, and they have accepted. They have no doubt left businesses that paid equal or perhaps greater compensation than that which they are to receive as emoluments for occupying these offices. In view of the law as it was originally fixed, after careful deliberation on the part of the Senate, they have concluded to accept these offices. The salary was fixed at \$10,000. After we have gotten them installed in office, after they have performed some of the duties, after they have severed their connection, no doubt, with other businesses in their respective homes and States, I can not see the justice of now cutting down the amount to \$7,500.

I must say that I was originally in favor of making the salary \$7,500. I thought that was a fair compensation. In fact, I believe that very few officers should get salaries in excess of those which Senators of the United States receive; but that idea did not prevail. The other idea did prevail.

When the salary has been fixed in this way, it seems to me it is doing an injustice to these men, if now, after they have made their status in accordance with this salary, we conclude that it is too much, and that it should be reduced. If we are going to reduce it, the reduction ought to take effect at some future time, a considerable time off, so that they can, as a

matter of fact, get the benefit of this salary which they have accepted in view of the offer and appointment which were made. It is unfair to them; and it seems to me we ought to adhere to the provision which was made in the Federal farm-loan act, and keep the salary at \$10,000.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have a vivid recollection of the debate on the farm-loan bill and the very close vote on the fixing of the salaries at \$10,000. I believe those salaries were reduced in Committee of the Whole by one vote, and I have forgotten what the precise vote was when the matter went to the Senate. Perhaps there was a majority of one or two in favor of the higher salary.

Mr. SMOOT. One.

Mr. GALLINGER. One, the Senator from Utah says, in favor of the bill as it stands; so that there was no very loud declaration on the part of the Senate in favor of fixing these salaries at \$10,000.

Mr. President, I gladly voted to fix the salaries of the members of the Tariff Board at \$7,500, believing that to be sufficient. I have believed that there are two or three other boards getting \$10,000 a year that ought to be reduced to \$7,500; and, having voted for the \$7,500 salary in the first place, I have seen no reason why I should change my vote.

It will be remembered, Mr. President, that not only do these men get as much as Members of the two Houses of Congress, but they have all their traveling expenses paid, and they are at very little expense to themselves, certainly, when they are away from Washington, and they have been away from Washington a very considerable part of the time since the board was established. They have had the privilege of seeing the country, which is not allowed to men in public life, as a rule, at the expense of the Government.

I should be loath, Mr. President, to do anything that would in any way injure the agricultural interests of the country. I have a very warm regard for the men who toil on the farms and who are producing the necessities of life. It does seem to me, however, that the salary that is given to these men as the bill now stands is entirely adequate in every sense of the word; and I hope that the amendment submitted by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] will not prevail. These men will continue to serve. If they do not, there are hundreds of other men of equal capacity who will very gladly take their places. There is no danger of there being any vacancies on this board, Mr. President, certainly not long at a time; and in view of the fact that we are denying increases of salary to the lower paid employees of the Government on the plea of economy and the stress so far as the revenues of the Government are concerned, I think it would be a very great mistake if we should agree to the amendment that is now under consideration.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question before he takes his seat?

Mr. GALLINGER. Certainly.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Does not the Senator think that if he were appointed to a position for a term of six or eight years at a fixed salary, and the first year after he accepted the office the salary were reduced one-fourth, it would be unfair to him?

Mr. GALLINGER. I do not think so. I would have the option of resigning, if I chose.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Yes; but you have changed your situation. You have changed your status. You have given up your position at home. You have given up your salary there.

Mr. GALLINGER. I simply do not take that view of the case at all. If, in the wisdom of Congress, my salary should be reduced, I might make the same plea, that I accepted it when I was elected at a given figure, and that Congress in its wisdom had reduced it, and hence had done me a wrong. I would not think Congress had done me any wrong. I could either stay or leave, as I thought was to my best interest.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. SMOOT. On that I call for the yeas and nays.

Mr. HOLLIS. Mr. President, when the Farm Loan Board act was originally drawn the Federal Reserve Board had been established with salaries of \$12,000 for each member. It was the intention to make the Farm Loan Board of commensurate dignity, and to have its members of commensurate ability; and the original bill fixed the salaries at \$12,000. Later it was voted to make the Farm Loan Board a bureau in the Treasury Department; the number of members was cut from five to four, and the salary was reduced from \$12,000 to \$10,000. When the bill was on the floor of the Senate the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] moved to reduce the compensation still

further, and the Senate finally voted that it would not reduce the compensation further.

The Senator from Utah is a persistent and industrious Member of the Senate. He has the advantage of being an important member of the Appropriations Committee, and when the time came around to make the appropriations for the Farm Loan Board for this session he asked the Appropriations Committee to cut the salary to \$7,500. The matter was referred to a subcommittee. The subcommittee reported against the Senator from Utah, but he was not discouraged. He carried it before the full committee and got a majority of one or two in favor of his contention. Now he assures us that he is not unfriendly to the farm-loan act and that he voted for it; but his whole attitude throughout the debate on the floor was hostile, and I for one was very much surprised when he finally declared his intention of voting for it, and did so.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. The only justification the Senator has for saying that my attitude was hostile is because I offered certain amendments to the bill that I thought would improve the bill; and I still believe that if those amendments had been adopted the law would have been a better law than it is to-day. I never was hostile to the bill. I never intended to vote against the bill, and I did vote for it, as I stated to the Senate a short time ago.

Mr. HOLLIS. Then the Senator, on his statement, is not satisfied with the law as it stands to-day.

Mr. SMOOT. No.

Mr. HOLLIS. If the Senator never has been hostile to it, if his amendment prevails to-day, it will always be understood that he is hostile to it and that the Senate of the United States is hostile to these four men, who have performed their duties very intelligently, very economically, and very fairly—men who were not known to me at all before they were appointed, but whose actions I heartily indorse now that I know them; men who have been learning the duties of the office at the expense of the Government; men who, if they are self-respecting men, will resign if this slap is made at them by Congress. We will lose the benefit of what they have learned, the training they have received. We will have to have a new set of men go in, who will have to learn it all over again, and the continuity will be broken up. The Senator suggests that when the Federal Trade Commission appropriations come in he will make the same movement against them; and the same action will be construed by the country as a belief on the part of the Senator from Utah that they are not properly performing their functions.

I hope that those who believe in the Federal farm-loan act, and who believe that it should be administered in accordance with the original idea, will vote in favor of this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] to the amendment of the committee. On that question the yeas and nays have been requested. Is the request seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CURTIS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. GALLINGER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from New York [Mr. O'GORMAN]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] and vote "nay."

Mr. MYERS (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. OVERMAN (when Mr. SIMMONS's name was called). My colleague [Mr. SIMMONS] is absent on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. TILLMAN (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. GOFF] to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA] and vote "nay."

Mr. JONES (when Mr. TOWNSEND's name was called). I desire to state that the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (when his name was called). I desire to ask whether the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. HARDING] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Ohio. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN] and vote "yea."

Mr. WALSH (when his name was called). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] to the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] and vote "yea."

Mr. WILLIAMS (when his name was called). Transferring my pair with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] to the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN], I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JAMES. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] to the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. NEWLANDS] and vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS. I transfer my pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] to the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] and vote "yea."

Mr. BECKHAM (after having voted in the affirmative). I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT] to the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. HUSTING] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. REED. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] to the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] and vote "nay."

Mr. LODGE (after having voted in the negative). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH]. I see that the Senator is absent. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from California [Mr. WORKS] and will allow my vote to stand.

Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey. I desire to state that the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] is detained on official business. He has a pair with the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CATRON] is paired with the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN].

The result was announced—yeas 43, nays 18, as follows.

#### YEAS—43.

Bankhead	James	Phelan	Sterling
Beckham	Johnson, Me.	Pittman	Stone
Brady	Johnson, S. Dak.	Poindexter	Swanson
Bryan	La Follette	Pomerene	Thomas
Chilton	Lane	Ransdell	Thompson
Cummins	Lee, Md.	Robinson	Underwood
Fletcher	Lewis	Shafroth	Vardaman
Gronna	Martine, N. J.	Sheppard	Walsh
Hitchcock	Myers	Shields	Watson
Hollis	Norris	Smith, Ariz.	Williams
Hughes	Overman	Smith, S. C.	

#### NAYS—18.

Borah	Gallinger	Nelson	Tillman
Brandagee	Jones	Page	Wadsworth
Clark	Kenyon	Reed	Warren
Fall	Lodge	Sherman	
Fernald	McCumber	Smoot	

#### NOT VOTING—35.

Ashurst	du Pont	Lippitt	Simmons
Broussard	Goff	McLean	Smith, Ga.
Catron	Gore	Martin, Va.	Smith, Md.
Chamberlain	Harding	Newlands	Smith, Mich.
Clapp	Hardwick	O'Gorman	Sutherland
Colt	Husting	Oliver	Townsend
Culberson	Kern	Owen	Weeks
Curtis	Kirby	Penrose	Works
Dillingham	Lea, Tenn.	Saulsbury	

So Mr. ROBINSON's amendment to the amendment of the committee was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLIS. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

Mr. OVERMAN. Before any more business is done—

Mr. JONES. I desire merely to offer an amendment for printing.

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES. I submit an amendment which I intend to offer to the bill proposing to strike out all the unnecessary committees of the Senate. I ask that it may be printed and lie on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. OVERMAN. Will the Senator from New Hampshire yield to me?

Mr. HOLLIS. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I wish to lay the appropriation bill aside for to-day, and I call the attention of the Senator from Montana

[Mr. MYERS] to it so that the unfinished business may not lose its place. After it is laid aside and the unfinished business is laid before the Senate, I will then ask that a message from the President of the United States be read. The appropriation bill will be laid aside until to-morrow, and I give notice that at the close of the morning business I shall ask the Senate to resume its consideration.

#### NAVAL OIL SUPPLY.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I should like to insert in the RECORD correspondence with the Secretary of the Interior on the subject of the oil-leasing bill growing out of a discussion in this body a few days ago. I am sure it will elucidate the matter.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. FRANKLIN K. LANE,  
Secretary of the Interior.

JANUARY 15, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Referring to your letter of January 10, 1917, addressed to Senator THOMAS, which was recently read in the Senate and which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 12, I beg to say that your reference to the original amendment proposed by me has led to some confusion in the minds of Senators as to the attitude of the department toward the general leasing bill in so far as it grants relief to the California locators.

You seem to be ignorant of the fact that on calendar day, January the 5th, 1917, I introduced two amendments to H. R. 406 as a report from the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate—one to section 9 and one to section 10—which amendments I herewith inclose for the purpose of eliciting an expression of your views.

Senator THOMAS stated correctly that the attorney from your department, Mr. Finney, gave his approval to the amendment to section 9, and when asked made no objection to section 10, with the concurrence of Mr. Clay Tallman, Commissioner of the General Land Office, who was present. These two gentlemen represented your department at the conference where the Public Lands Committees of the Senate and the House, the Department of the Navy, and the Department of Justice were represented. The amendment proposed by me to section 9, with the exception of the date, is the same amendment in words and form that was submitted by Mr. Tallman and Mr. Finney as agreeable to the department and offered as a compromise measure to the conference, but which was not finally approved, although received hospitably by the Navy Department and the Department of Justice.

I assume that these departments are standing upon their legal victories where the courts, in interpreting the Pickett Act, very strictly construed its provisions against the locators of oil lands, whereas it was the legislative intent to grant them relief. As lawmakers, we are endeavoring to correct the relief legislation as originally intended, to meet the legal objections raised by the courts.

Now, as Mr. Finney and Mr. Tallman, representatives of your department at the conference, submitted and approved the amendment to section 9 as above, which I introduced on January 12 in the Senate, I desire to know from you if this amendment has your approval. I would also like to know your opinion as to the amendment to section 10, considered independently of the amendment to section 9.

I have the assurance of the California Oil Association that the holders of patented lands in naval reserve No. 1 will relinquish their claims provided the relief proposed in this bill is granted and by that means I believe the conference has accomplished much for the Navy by insuring it an undisputed reserve in naval reserve No. 1. Naval reserve No. 2, which is practically the only reserve affected by this proposed amendment, can not, in any event, on account of the large number of wells therein now in operation and held in private ownership, be regarded as a reserve at all, no matter what action may be taken by the Congress.

Very truly, yours,

JAMES D. PHELAN.

THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, January 17, 1917.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As you assume, I was ignorant of the new Phelan amendment to which you refer. I did not know that there was a new Phelan amendment when I wrote to Senator Thomas. I did know, however, that there had been an effort made by your committee to arrive at an adjustment with the Secretary of the Navy and the Attorney General, but I did not know that this had ever been put into the shape of an amendment to the general oil-leasing bill, or that it had been submitted formally to your committee or the Senate. In this effort Commissioner Tallman and Mr. Finney, of this department, were authorized by me to give all the help possible to your committee and to make suggestions that might lead to breaking the deadlock that keeps our oil lands undeveloped. I understand that this amendment was in part suggested by them as a possible basis for compromise.

In advocating the passage of the general oil-leasing bill in my report for 1915 I touched upon one phase of the oil situation, saying:

"President Taft withdrew a large acreage in California and in Wyoming after much of it had been filed upon and after some development had been begun on a part of the lands. This withdrawal took place in September, 1909, and withdrew part of the lands for the benefit of the Navy as a fuel reserve and other of the lands were to be held awaiting appropriate legislation for their disposal. The total acreage withdrawn was 3,041,000 acres, of which perhaps one-half was then in private ownership. There was doubt at the time of these withdrawals as to their legality, there being no specific statute on the books authorizing the action. So serious was this doubt that as a precautionary measure Congress at its next session passed an act authorizing such withdrawals, and the same lands were subsequently, in July, 1910, withdrawn again. It was the opinion of many of the most competent members of the bar that the withdrawal of 1909 was void and the operators proceeded to act in accordance with this advice. The result was that when the second withdrawal, that of 1910, was made, there were a large number of operators engaged in drilling and some had already found oil on these lands. The Government insisted upon the validity of the 1909 withdrawal, and after failing to have its view sustained in the lower courts, was at last successful before the Supreme Court. So that to-day those who were not engaged in actual development of the lands at the time of the first withdrawal have no legal

title to the lands. If the full measure of the Government's right is acted upon as a basis of our policy in dealing with these lands, it will bankrupt many oil companies and do what appears to me to be an unjust and an unnecessary injustice to those who have invested many millions of dollars under a mistake as to the law. I shall not assume to say what policy should be followed as to naval reserves, but as to the other withdrawn lands I believe Congress (which is the one forum wherein relief can be sought) should so act as to recognize the equitable rights of those operators. This might be done by saying that those who would to-day be entitled to patent were the land not withdrawn may have leases under which they will pay a liberal royalty to the Government. This plan will doubtless be urged. I am of the opinion that it is too liberal. We might draw a line at the time of the second withdrawal. If this were done, leases could be made to all who were actually operating upon this land at that time. And if it is thought advisable, there could be imposed a higher royalty than would be called for under the general development bill. I feel that this is one of those situations often arising in the life of the individual and of the State when it is not wise to exact all that the law allows even as to those who are in the wrong."

As you will note from the above quotation, I did not assume to say what policy should be followed as to the naval reserves, but urged that as to the other withdrawn lands Congress should so act as to recognize the equitable rights of those operators who had gone upon the lands and developed them. There are now withdrawn from public entry a total of 6,570,232 acres of oil lands. These withdrawals have been made upon the advice of the Geological Survey. Of this great body of land there are reserved for naval purposes, Naval Reserve No. 1, 38,068 acres in California; Naval Reserve No. 2, 30,181 acres in California; Naval Reserve No. 3, 9,481 acres in Wyoming; a total of 77,730 acres, exclusive of two withdrawals recently made of naval oil shale in Utah and Colorado, totaling 132,024 acres. So that we have oil withdrawals of nearly six and a half million acres which are not held as naval reserves. Two of the naval reserves, No. 1 and No. 3 (estimated to contain approximately 130,000,000 barrels), are either free of private claims or can be made so. Naval Reserve No. 2 is within the patented land grant of the Southern Pacific Co., and also includes several thousand acres patented to the State of California and private individuals. So that there is comparatively a small amount of land, perhaps less than 5,000 acres, which would be affected by the relief provisions of your amendment. The Government has sued for the alternate sections within these reserves, and if these are recovered these lands would not be subject to the provisions of this bill, as I understand it.

It had seemed to me that to withhold such legislation as the proposed general leasing bill, and thus keep over 6,000,000 acres of oil lands locked up indefinitely, because there is doubt as to the policy that should be pursued as to part of one naval oil reserve, is not the wisest course, as it would permit one obstacle to master a truly national need. Therefore I had hoped that a plan could be developed by which these conflicts could be avoided and a bill agreed upon that would, perhaps, not be entirely satisfactory to anyone and yet be so reasonable as to insure its passage by both Houses.

If it is your desire to secure my personal view as to the wisdom of compromising, as proposed, with the locators on the one naval reservation involved (No. 2), I would say that I can not properly give such opinion because another department of the Government is primarily involved in such action.

It is not to be overlooked that the present bill involves not only oil but phosphate, potash, and sodium lands, of which we have several millions of acres under withdrawal. The time is ripe for the development of these lands to furnish fertilizers for our soil and chemicals that are invaluable to the Army and the Navy, as well as to many industries.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE.

HON. JAMES D. PHELAN,  
United States Senate.

#### WATER-POWER DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 408.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 408) to provide for the development of water power and the use of public lands in relation thereto, and for other purposes.

Mr. MYERS. I understood the Senator from North Carolina to state that he was going to ask that a message from the President of the United States be laid before the Senate.

Mr. OVERMAN. I make that request. I merely yielded to the Senator from Montana to call up the unfinished business.

#### DEATH OF ADMIRAL DEWEY (H. DOC. NO. 1945).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which will be read.

The message was read, as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

It is with the deepest regret that I announce to the Congress the death of Admiral George Dewey at 5.56 o'clock on the afternoon of yesterday, the 16th of January, at his residence in this city.

Admiral Dewey entered the naval service of the country as an acting midshipman from the first congressional district of Vermont on September 23, 1854; was graduated from the Naval Academy as midshipman June 11, 1858; served with distinction throughout the war of 1861-1865; and 30 years later had risen to the rank of commodore. It was as commodore that he rendered the service in the action of Manila Bay which has given him a place forever memorable in the naval annals of the country. At the time of his death he held the exceptional rank of the

Admiral of the Navy by special act of Congress. During the later years of his life he was the honored president of the General Board of the Navy, to whose duties he gave the most assiduous attention, and in which office he rendered a service to the Navy quite invaluable in its sincerity and quality of practical sagacity.

It is pleasant to recall what qualities gave him his well-deserved fame—his practical directness, his courage without self-consciousness, his efficient capacity in matters of administration, the readiness to fight without asking any questions or hesitating about any detail. It was by such qualities that he continued and added luster to the best traditions of our Navy. He had the stuff in him which all true men admire and upon which all statesmen must depend in hours of peril. The people and the Government of the United States will always rejoice to perpetuate his name in all honor and affection.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 17, 1917.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, our country has lost another great naval hero. George Dewey, Admiral of the Navy and hero of Manila Bay, died last evening at 5.56 o'clock. His spirit was the spirit of John Paul Jones, of Stephen Decatur, of James Lawrence, of Oliver Hazard Perry, of David Farragut. He upheld and illustrated the traditions which these men and others like them established. He knew no fear. His first thought always was the Navy and his duty to it, as was his last thought. John Paul Jones, with his ship sinking under, replied, in answer to a summons to surrender, "I have not yet begun to fight"; Perry's message after his famous victory was "We have met the enemy and they are ours"; James Lawrence, mortally wounded, shouting with his last breath, "Don't give up the ship"; Farragut, sailing into Mobile Bay, which was said to be filled with torpedoes, said, "Damn the torpedoes; go ahead"; and Dewey, entering Manila Bay, with mines and torpedoes under him and shore batteries and enemy ships firing on him, uttered not a word until he gave the famous order, clearly and quietly, as if he were talking of another matter, "You may fire when you are ready, Gridley."

Admiral Dewey was a lineal descendant of the heroes who preceded him. We can not do him too much honor.

I ask immediate consideration of the resolutions which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions will be read.

The resolutions (S. Res. 321) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has learned with profound grief of the death of Admiral of the Navy George Dewey, who has served his country brilliantly for more than 62 years.

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate is directed to transmit to his bereaved family a copy of these resolutions and an assurance of the sympathy of the Senate in the loss they have sustained.

*Resolved*, That the President of the Senate appoint a committee of seven Members to confer with a like committee of the House, and, after consultation with the family of the deceased, to take such action as may be appropriate in regard to the public funeral of Admiral Dewey.

The VICE PRESIDENT, under the third resolution, appointed as the committee on the part of the Senate Mr. TILLMAN, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. BRYAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Maine, Mr. CLAPP, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. PAGE.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President, I move, as a further mark of respect, that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 18, 1917, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, January 17, 1917.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Isidore Lewinthal, of Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, to Thee do we come in this hour and ask for Thy guidance. Do Thou grant wisdom and understanding to the Members of this House, so that they may acquit themselves of and discharge their duties as fully as their hearts desire to do so.

We thank thee, O Lord, that the lines have been cast to us in pleasant places. We have indeed a goodly heritage. We stand upon a shore unshaken, to look out upon the nations of the earth that are rocked and tossed as a ship upon the sea bestormed. We are in peace, while they are in tumult; we are without blood, while they are walking in garments rolled in blood. O do Thou grant that these struggles may speedily tend toward peace.

We beseech Thee that Thou wilt unite the hearts of men together in common citizenship; may they be inspired with

a common desire for purity, for uprightness, for integrity in civil things.

O grant that in this great Nation there may be none that shall shrink from duty, none shall fear to speak and act for truth and for liberty. Grant that evil be smitten down and pierced through and destroyed, justice established, purity in the place of corruption stand forth, and all nations see the beginning of Thy salvation in the midst of this people. Into Thy keeping do we commend the President of these United States, the Speaker of this House, the Members of this Congress, and all the constituted authorities, so that through them order may be preserved and right and liberty be fostered. And Thine alone, O God, shall be the praise and glory, now and evermore. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 5718) to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project, Arizona.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 10384. An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States.

### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. PRATT, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday business to-day. Is there objection?

Mr. KEATING. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KITCHIN. I move, then, Mr. Speaker, that we dispense with the business of Calendar Wednesday to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina moves that the business of Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-day. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. In the judgment of the Chair, two-thirds—

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withhold the point of no quorum in order that the Committee on Rules may present a matter to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withholds the point of order.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MANN. Was the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] agreed to?

The SPEAKER. No. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] raised the point of no quorum, and the Chair started to count, and then he withdrew his point of no quorum long enough for the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POUL] to make some kind of a motion or report. The motion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] is still pending.

Mr. MANN. What is the effect of it, then?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado [Mr. KEATING] withdrew his point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. MANN. Then the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] was agreed to?

The SPEAKER. No. It never was put.

Mr. MANN. Oh, yes; the Chair put it and declared it was carried.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had forgotten that.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Chair will recall that I withdrew the motion for the purpose of allowing the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POUL] to present this matter from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman "withheld"—that is the language he used—his point of order that there was no quorum present and stated specifically that he did it to give the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POUL] a chance to do something. I do not know what it is that he wants to do.

Mr. MANN. He may renew his point of no quorum, but it will not have any effect on the vote that was taken.

Mr. KEATING. Then I can not withdraw my point of no quorum?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman can not do what he tried to do.

The SPEAKER. What was the point the gentleman from Illinois makes?

Mr. MANN. A vote was taken, and the Chair must declare the result of it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was going to do it, and the gentleman from Colorado intervened with the point of order that there was no quorum present.

Mr. MANN. I understand; but you can not bring in, before the Chair disclosed the result of it, some other matter.

Mr. KITCHIN. Except by unanimous consent. I think the gentleman from Illinois is correct. The Chair had already announced the vote, and the gentleman from Colorado made the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Colorado insists upon his point of order, the Chair will have to sustain it.

Mr. KEATING. I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEATING. In case the Chair finds a quorum is not present, will a vote come on the motion of the gentleman from North Carolina?

The SPEAKER. It will. [After counting.] One hundred and fifty-eight gentlemen present, not a quorum. The Doorkeeper will lock the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. The question is on dispensing with Calendar Wednesday business for to-day.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 319, nays 31, answered "present" 0, not voting 84, as follows:

## YEAS—319.

Abercrombie	Davenport	Harrison, Miss.	McLaughlin
Adair	Davis, Tex.	Haskell	McLemore
Adamson	Decker	Hastings	Magee
Alken	Dempsey	Haugen	Maher
Alexander	Denison	Hawley	Mann
Allen	Dent	Hayden	Martin
Almon	Dickinson	Hayes	Matthews
Anthony	Dies	Heaton	Mays
Aswell	Dill	Hedlin	Miller, Minn.
Austin	Dillon	Helm	Miller, Pa.
Ayres	Dixon	Helverling	Mondell
Bailey	Doolittle	Hensley	Montague
Barkley	Doremus	Hernandez	Moon
Barnhart	Doughton	Hicks	Moore, Pa.
Bell	Dowell	Hilliard	Moore, Ind.
Black	Drukker	Holland	Morgan, La.
Blackmon	Dunn	Hollingsworth	Morgan, Okla.
Booher	Dupré	Hood	Mott
Borland	Dyer	Hopwood	Mudd
Bowers	Eagan	Houston	Murray
Britt	Eagle	Howard	Nelson
Britten	Edmonds	Howell	Nicholls, S. C.
Browne	Elston	Huddleston	Nichols, Mich.
Browning	Emerson	Hughes	North
Bruckner	Esch	Hulbert	Norton
Brumbaugh	Estopinal	Hull, Iowa	Oldfield
Buchanan, Tex.	Evans	Hull, Tenn.	Oliver
Burgess	Fairchild	Husted	Olney
Burke	Farley	Hutchinson	O'Shaunessy
Burnett	Farr	Igoe	Page, N. C.
Byrns, Tenn.	Fields	James	Paige, Mass.
Calliwell	Fitzgerald	Jones	Park
Campbell	Flynn	Kahn	Parker, N. J.
Candler, Miss.	Focht	Kearns	Parker, N. Y.
Cannon	Fordney	Kelley	Patten
Capstick	Foss	Kettner	Phelan
Caraway	Foster	Key, Ohio	Platt
Carew	Freeman	Kless, Pa.	Porter
Carlin	Fuller	Kincheloe	Pou
Carter, Okla.	Gallagher	King	Powers
Chandler, N. Y.	Gandy	Kinkaid	Quin
Charles	Gard	Kitchin	Ragsdale
Clark, Fla.	Garland	Konop	Raker
Cline	Garner	Lafean	Ramseyer
Coleman	Garrett	Lazaro	Randall
Collier	Gillett	Lee	Rayburn
Connelly	Glynn	Lehlbach	Ricketts
Conry	Godwin, N. C.	Leshner	Riordan
Cooper, Ohio	Gordon	Linthicum	Rodenberg
Cooper, W. Va.	Gould	Littlepage	Rogers
Cooper, Wis.	Gray, Ala.	Lloyd	Rouse
Copley	Gray, N. J.	London	Rowe
Cox	Green, Iowa	Loud	Rubey
Crago	Greene, Mass.	McAndrews	Rucker, Ga.
Crisp	Greene, Vt.	McArthur	Rucker, Mo.
Crosser	Gregg	McCracken	Russell, Mo.
Curry	Griest	McCulloch	Saunders
Dale, N. Y.	Guernsey	McDermott	Scott, Mich.
Dale, Vt.	Hadley	McFadden	Sears
Dallinger	Hamilton, Mich.	McGillcuddy	Sells
Danforth	Hamlin	McKellar	Shackleford
Darrow	Hardy	McKinley	Shallenberger

Sherwood  
Shouse  
Siegel  
Sims  
Sisson  
Slayden  
Slomp  
Sloan  
Small  
Smith, Mich.  
Smith, Minn.  
Smith, N. Y.  
Smith, Tex.  
Snell  
Snyder  
Sparkman  
Stafford  
Steagall

Stedman  
Steele, Iowa  
Steele, Pa.  
Steenserson  
Stephens, Miss.  
Stephens, Nebr.  
Stephens, Tex.  
Sterling  
Stone  
Stout  
Sulloway  
Summers  
Sutherland  
Sweet  
Swift  
Switzer  
Taggart  
Tague

Talbott  
Taylor, Ark.  
Temple  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Tillman  
Tinkham  
Timberlake  
Towner  
Treadway  
Van Dyke  
Venable  
Vinson  
Volstead  
Walker  
Walsh  
Ward

Wason  
Watkins  
Watson, Pa.  
Watson, Va.  
Webb  
Whaley  
Wheeler  
Williams, T. S.  
Williams, Ohio  
Wilson, Ill.  
Wilson, La.  
Wingo  
Winslow  
Wood, Ind.  
Woods, Iowa  
Young, N. Dak.  
Young, Tex.

## NAYS—31.

Anderson  
Ashbrook  
Buchanan, Ill.  
Butler  
Cary  
Cramton  
Ellsworth  
Fess

Frear  
Good  
Gray, Ind.  
Helgesen  
Humphrey, Wash.  
Johnson, Ky.  
Johnson, Wash.  
Keating

La Follette  
Lenroot  
Lindbergh  
McKenzie  
Madden  
Mapes  
Miller, Del.  
Morrison

Moss  
Nolan  
Oakley  
Reavis  
Reilly  
Schall  
Tavener

## NOT VOTING—84.

Bacharach  
Barchfeld  
Beakes  
Beales  
Benedict  
Bennet  
Byrnes, S. C.  
Callaway  
Cantrill  
Carter, Mass.  
Casey  
Chiperfield  
Church  
Coady  
Costello  
Cullop  
Davis, Minn.  
Dewalt  
Dooling  
Driscoll  
Edwards

Ferris  
Finley  
Flood  
Gallivan  
Gardner  
Glass  
Goodwin, Ark.  
Graham  
Griffin  
Hamill  
Hamilton, N. Y.  
Harrison, Va.  
Hart  
Henry  
Hill  
Hinds  
Humphreys, Miss.  
Jacoway  
Johnson, S. Dak.  
Keister  
Kennedy, Iowa

Kennedy, R. I.  
Kent  
Kreider  
Langley  
Lever  
Lewis  
Lieb  
Liebel  
Lobeck  
Loft  
Longworth  
McClintic  
Meeker  
Mooney  
Morin  
Neely  
Oglesby  
Overmyer  
Padgett  
Peters  
Pratt

Price  
Rainey  
Rauch  
Roberts, Mass.  
Roberts, Nev.  
Rowland  
Russell, Ohio  
Sabath  
Sanford  
Scott, Pa.  
Scully  
Sherley  
Sinnott  
Smith, Idaho  
Stiness  
Taylor, Colo.  
Vare  
Williams, W. E.  
Wilson, Fla.  
Wise  
Woodyard

So the motion to dispense with Calendar Wednesday was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas with Mr. STINESS.

Mr. LOBECK with Mr. CHIPERFIELD.

Mr. LEVER with Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi with Mr. MOONEY.

Mr. HAMILL with Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania.

Mr. GALLIVAN with Mr. HILL.

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. CASEY with Mr. ROBERTS of Nevada.

Mr. CALLAWAY with Mr. SANFORD.

Mr. BEAKES with Mr. HAMILTON of New York.

Mr. SCULLY with Mr. HINDS.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado with Mr. LONGWORTH.

Mr. NEELY with Mr. PRATT.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina with Mr. BACHARACH.

Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. BARCHFELD.

Mr. CHURCH with Mr. BEALES.

Mr. COADY with Mr. BENEDICT.

Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. BENNET.

Mr. DEWALT with Mr. CARTER of Massachusetts.

Mr. DOOLING with Mr. COSTELLO.

Mr. DRISCOLL with Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. WISE with Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. FERRIS with Mr. KEISTER.

Mr. FINLEY with Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa.

Mr. FLOOD with Mr. KREIDER.

Mr. GLASS with Mr. LANGLEY.

Mr. GRIFFIN with Mr. MEEKER.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia with Mr. MORIN.

Mr. SABATH with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. RAUCH with Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts.

Mr. JACOWAY with Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. SHERLEY with Mr. RUSSELL of Ohio.

Mr. RAINEY with Mr. SINNOTT.

Mr. LIEBEL with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.

Mr. LOFT with Mr. VARE.

Mr. MCCLINTIC with Mr. WOODYARD.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## RULES COMMITTEE COMMITTEE HEARINGS.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I ask unanimous consent that the time within which to report on House resolution 429 be extended to 30 days.

The SPEAKER. From to-day?

Mr. **POU**. From this day.

The **SPEAKER**. The gentleman from North Carolina, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, asks unanimous consent that the time for the investigation which the committee has been making be extended 30 days from to-day. Is there objection?

Mr. **STAFFORD**. Reserving the right to object, I assume that the Committee on Rules is proceeding with the idea that the committee itself will go on with the investigation rather than to have a separate committee of the House appointed to investigate the leak charges?

Mr. **POU**. Not entirely so. I think most of the majority and the minority of the committee feel that we should go further.

Mr. **STAFFORD**. I believe the gentleman has a further resolution authorizing the committee to employ counsel aiding in the investigation of these charges?

Mr. **POU**. That is true.

Mr. **STAFFORD**. Is not that predicated on the idea that the committee itself should go into an investigation of the various charges rather than to permit an investigation by another committee?

Mr. **POU**. It is.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. **CAMPBELL**. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to state for the minority members of the Committee on Rules that they have felt and now feel that a special committee should have been appointed to make the investigation; but if that is not to be done, they do feel that the Committee on Rules should proceed with the investigation and that that committee should be equipped in every way to make a thorough investigation.

Mr. **GREEN** of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. **CAMPBELL**. Certainly.

Mr. **GREEN** of Iowa. Would not the acceptance of this proposition mean that there would be no special committee?

Mr. **CAMPBELL**. That may be the result of the action here to-day, that the investigation shall be made by the committee, as stated by the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. **BARNHART**. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. **CAMPBELL**. Yes.

Mr. **BARNHART**. What reason does the minority entertain for saying that a special committee would be more efficient than the Committee on Rules?

Mr. **CAMPBELL**. In the first place, this is the short session, and the Committee on Rules has a great deal of work to do. As one member of that committee I have thought that a special committee should be appointed and the Committee on Rules left to do the usual work of that committee.

Mr. **HOWARD**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to ask the gentleman from North Carolina a question. In response to a question propounded by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. **STAFFORD**] the gentleman from North Carolina stated that he had a resolution authorizing the Committee on Rules to employ counsel. I would like to ask the gentleman if he intends to give the House, after the introduction of the resolution, any time in which to debate that particular portion of this investigation.

Mr. **POU**. I have no objection to a reasonable time.

Mr. **HOWARD**. The reason that I reserved an objection and asked the question is that I am basing what I am about to say on what I have seen in the morning press. I want at least two or three minutes to make some observations on the character of counsel that will probably be employed and the amount that is going to be paid to him, and so forth and so on. If the previous question is going to be moved on this resolution immediately upon its being read, I shall necessarily, viewing this important matter from my own standpoint, interpose an objection to any unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. **LENROOT**. But the only question now is the unanimous consent for extension of time.

Mr. **HOWARD**. I have no objection to the extension of time as long as this committee thinks it is wise for a thorough investigation. If the press report is true, I would like one or two minutes to say a few things.

Mr. **COOPER** of Wisconsin rose.

The **SPEAKER**. For what purpose does the gentleman from Wisconsin rise?

Mr. **COOPER** of Wisconsin. To reserve the right to object. I want to ask the gentleman from North Carolina how long a time there will be to discuss the question of the appointment of counsel.

Mr. **POU**. I think the gentleman from Kansas and myself will have no trouble in agreeing on the time.

Mr. **CAMPBELL**. The gentleman from North Carolina will have an hour, and can divide up that time if he sees fit. I have no doubt he will give half of an hour of the time to this side of the House.

Mr. **POU**. I certainly will.

Mr. **COOPER** of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this investigation, this whole business, is not only vastly important but in some respects it is also deplorable, because thus far the proceedings have tended to confirm the suspicions already too prevalent throughout the country that there is no fine sense of honor in the public life of this Nation. Already it has degenerated into a partisan struggle. I regretted exceedingly, during the debate the other day, to hear members of the Committee on Rules—the committee conducting this investigation—charge that this side of the House was actuated only by a desire to cripple the efforts of the President in his negotiations for peace—a motive as thoroughly despicable as any that could actuate the members of a legislative body. And yet three members of the Rules Committee declared here in debate that we on this side of the aisle were prompted by that motive in urging an investigation of charges which put a stain upon the reputation of the American House of Representatives.

Now, it is in my mind a serious question what sort of counsel a committee whose majority hold such views and make such charges would employ, and what kind of an investigation we would have?

Mr. **FITZGERALD**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that this discussion is not in order at this time.

The **SPEAKER**. Does the gentleman from North Carolina mean 30 calendar days or 30 legislative days?

Mr. **POU**. Thirty calendar days.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina to extend the time for this investigation for 30 calendar days?

Mr. **GREEN** of Iowa rose.

The **SPEAKER**. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. **GREEN** of Iowa. To reserve the right to object, and to ask the gentleman from North Carolina a question. Does the gentleman from North Carolina think that it is entirely proper that the Committee on Rules should proceed with an inquiry and investigation which involves a charge against one of its members?

Mr. **POU**. I think the committee will not be subject to any criticism in that respect; that is all I can say about it.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. **POU**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 451.

Authorizing the Committee on Rules to employ counsel and accountants, to sit during the sessions of the House and outside of Washington, and providing for expenses.

*Resolved*, That in the consideration of House resolutions 420, 429, and 446, referred to the Committee on Rules, said committee be and is authorized and empowered to employ counsel to aid in conducting the investigations which it has been directed by the House to make, and also to employ such expert accountants familiar with stock-exchange transactions as may be found necessary in conducting said investigation.

The Committee on Rules or any subcommittee thereof is authorized in the consideration of said resolutions to sit during the sessions of the House in Washington or elsewhere.

The expenses incident to the employment of counsel and accountants and those of the committee or subcommittee when sitting outside of Washington shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers signed by the chairman or acting chairman of said committee.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection?

Mr. **STAFFORD**. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire whether the committee has considered a limitation upon the amount that might be expended? It is customary in resolutions delegating authority to investigating committees to place some maximum amount on the sum to be expended by the committee. At least such was the practice in connection with the famous Michael Mulhall investigating committee, and it had a commendable effect upon the committee in its procedure. That committee, it is true, did not see fit to employ counsel. Members of the committee themselves performed the work of counsel. True, it was laborious work, but I do not question that counsel would be a valuable aid to this committee, and also an accountant in the investigation under consideration. I wish to submit the query whether there should not be some safeguarding of the interests of the Treasury, some limit beyond which the committee may not go in the matter of expenditures, so that they would not employ counsel without having some understanding in the beginning as to the amount counsel would charge for the work performed for this committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order that I may propound that inquiry.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman can not give me an opportunity to propound an inquiry, I shall have to object.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will withhold that demand for the regular order for a moment, I would like to state that I think there will not be any objection to placing a limitation upon the amount, if it is desired by the House to do so, and so far as the Committee on Rules is concerned, it is simply performing the duty thrust upon it by the House. We want the House to direct us what to do and what to expend. I do not think there will be any objection whatever to that course, if it is deemed desirable by the House.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that in all these matters where there has been an opportunity to employ counsel there has been serious complaint in this House when the amount of fees that were to be paid were known. The H. Snowden Marshall case that is now pending in this Congress has cost the Congress nearly \$20,000. The attorneys' fees are somewhere between \$11,000 and \$15,000. In the Pujo investigation it will be remembered what a contest we had upon the floor of the House about the fees that should be paid the attorneys in that case. In that case they amounted to \$15,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, if the House of Representatives is to employ counsel it ought to have the best counsel that can be had, and it can not afford to haggle about the price. If we can not afford to pay the ordinary charges that eminent lawyers in this country would charge some one else for the same service, we ought to quit and not try to get them. If we want somebody who is not competent, who is unfit, if we want to haggle over the price that he is to charge for his services, we better keep out of the market and not try to get any legal counsel.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the employment of good counsel. Personally I have no objection to the fees. I am simply calling the attention of the House to the fact now that if they want counsel the House must expect to pay good fees. That is the purpose I had in stating what I did. There ought not to be any haggling about it, as the gentleman says, but the House ought to understand in advance that if counsel is to be employed, and it desires to employ good counsel, it should be prepared to pay them the usual fees.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the amount that I am going to indicate will be used, but I am perfectly willing to have a proviso placed on the resolution that the amount expended shall not exceed \$15,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. That would be entirely satisfactory. The purpose of drawing attention to this is not to limit the activities of the committee unduly, but merely to place some restriction on the amount, so that it could employ the character of counsel that this investigation demands, but keep it within bounds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order that I may ask a question. Are not the majority of the members of this Committee on Rules lawyers themselves?

Mr. POUL. Well, they have got licenses to practice, I believe.

Mr. BURNETT. That would seem to indicate that they are not real lawyers. If that is so, then I think the committee ought to have counsel, and I should vote for the resolution, but I dissent from the imputation of the gentleman from North Carolina. I think that every one of them is a good lawyer; and that being so, why should any lawyer be employed to conduct that investigation?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from North Carolina permit me to make a suggestion?

Mr. POUL. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this matter has taken such a range that the members of the committee, whose ultimate duty is going to be as we see it now very largely judicial in character, labor under a very considerable embarrassment in any effort on the part of themselves to conduct the examination of witnesses. I feel sure that the gentleman from Alabama, if he has followed the hearings closely, can appreciate that fact. It is true that substantially all the members of the committee, nearly all the members of the committee except two, I believe, are lawyers, but in many investigations it would not be neces-

sary, I think, to have attorneys. We never found it necessary, as has been stated by the gentleman from Wisconsin, who was a very worthy, able, and efficient member of the special committee, to employ counsel in the Mulhall investigation, because it never reached that point where there was any embarrassment to the committee acting both as attorneys in the question and as judges on the final result, but in this investigation that situation has arisen. Then, there is this additional reason, I will say to the gentleman, while we are lawyers on the committee, most of us, there are certain things none of us know very much about; that is, the ins and outs of the stock exchange in New York, which will be involved in this investigation.

Mr. BURNETT. Then, the idea would be to employ some one familiar with those technical details and not a general lawyer like members of the committee are?

Mr. GARRETT. That is my idea.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. By permission of the gentleman from Tennessee, I would suggest if we possibly could get to the point of considering this resolution, then debate can follow that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have heard several names mentioned, one is that of Samuel Untermyer, of New York, and some gentlemen have indicated that such an appointment might not be wise. I have no suggestion to make about it, because the committee is able to handle that question itself, but names of men like Charles E. Hughes have been suggested and may be worthy of consideration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

SEVERAL DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS. Who is he?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will permit—

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Does not the gentleman think that the embarrassment to which he refers on the part of members of the committee may be relieved by selecting, say, three lawyers from the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct this investigation, and empower them, if they found it was necessary, to get outside counsel to assist them, if they so desired?

Mr. GARRETT. Well, I do not see, Mr. Speaker, where that would make any difference to the committee. It is not on account of anything in that way that makes embarrassment. It is by virtue of the relation by which members occupy to it and the duties they have to perform. The duties they have to perform are largely judicial in character. I think the same thing applies to any special committee created.

Mr. RAGSDALE. But my position was this, if the gentleman will permit me. The gentleman's committee discharges the duty of judges. Why not select from another committee three lawyers who can handle this investigation. The President of the United States can find judges from the floor of the House; why can not he find lawyers here?

Mr. GARRETT. Well, I do not know. Does the gentleman mean to get Members of the House who will perform the function of examiners before the committee?

Mr. RAGSDALE. Yes, sir.

Mr. GARRETT. Well, that might be done, but whether or not they would be willing to perform the duty is another thing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit one question?

Mr. GARRETT. I will.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Can the gentleman state what will be the probable scope of this inquiry?

Mr. GARRETT. I can not. The resolution is, of course, familiar to the gentleman, but I understood the gentleman to mean, if I understood him correctly, just how far the committee would go. I can not state that.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. As I understood, the original proposition was to authorize this committee to make a preliminary hearing to ascertain if there existed facts to justify the appointment of a special committee to make the investigation.

Mr. GARRETT. That was the original purpose.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Now, is it the purpose of the Committee on Rules to conduct the special investigation themselves without contemplating the appointment of any special committee?

Mr. GARRETT. I wish to say to the gentleman that I can not at this time answer the question, because I can not speak for the committee. I would venture the opinion that there has been a difference of sentiment in the committee upon the matter. At any rate we are all agreed that up to date we have not gone far enough to make an intelligent report to the House, and I feel that this resolution ought to be passed. As to how far we will

go, that is a matter which will yet have to be determined by the committee. We have not yet gone far enough. That is all I can say, in answering the gentleman as frankly as I can; we feel that the character of report the House would expect us to make—that is, to give the information to the House that we anticipate the House would expect us to make—is beyond any report that we might now make.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. It seems to me that the committee can without the aid of counsel specially employed arrive at a decision as to whether there probably exists a state of facts justifying an investigation. If it is the opinion of the committee that they should proceed with the investigation, having arrived at a conclusion that there exists that state of facts, then they ought to have counsel.

Mr. GARRETT. Of course, I can not answer the gentleman more fully than I have as to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for one hour.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] five minutes.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I would like in my time to offer this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOWARD: After the last word, insert: "Provided, That the aggregate expenses incurred by the committee shall, in the furtherance of said investigation, not exceed the sum of \$15,000."

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I have introduced this amendment—

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield before he begins his remarks?

Mr. HOWARD. With pleasure.

Mr. GARRETT. I presume that what the gentleman really desires is to limit the expense as to counsel fees and accountants. Now, for instance, if the gentleman will permit me, he provides there for the entire expenditure. The law provides witness fees and attendance, and I do not know how much has already been expended for witness fees. There have been a large number of people subpoenaed, and maybe a large number of others will be subpoenaed. I have no objection to what I think the gentleman has in mind, but it ought to be so worded as to apply simply to counsel and accountant fees, and personal expenses of the committee, if you want to apply it to them, but it ought not to affect witness fees.

Mr. HOWARD. In reply to the gentleman I would like to ask him a question. What do you anticipate this investigation is going to cost, exclusive of counsel fees and expert accountants?

Mr. GARRETT. I can not give the gentleman the slightest idea. That is utterly impossible.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, from my experience in matters of this kind, and especially those dealing with the intricate machinery of the New York Stock Exchange as it is conducted, I had as soon undertake to track a spider on water as to track one of these operators in the New York Stock Exchange if he desires to hide his operations. The main purpose of my introducing this amendment was to confine the expense of this committee to an economical basis. If what I believe is the truth—and gentlemen on this committee will follow me and make an answer to this proposition—I have seen in the morning press a statement to the effect that a certain prominent New York attorney is to be employed, but whether there is any prearrangement fixing his fees and the terms of his employment or not I do not know. Without the least reflection on anybody—and he may know all about the inner workings of the New York Stock Exchange—he may be the most expert man in the United States to investigate certain phases of the New York Stock Exchange, I want to say, and I say it only in my individual capacity as a Representative of my people on the floor of this House, that that man's services are not satisfactory to me.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes, sir; for a question.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman care to give the name of the attorney referred to?

Mr. HOWARD. Of course, I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman answer this: Did he read also that the name of that attorney was suggested by Mr. Lawson himself?

Mr. HOWARD. I did. Now, I always try to be frank, honest, and fair with my colleagues in the House. I have nothing to hide, and I say this on my responsibility as a Representative on this floor, that the services of Samuel Untermyer are not satisfactory to me and are not satisfactory to 90 per cent of my constituents. [Applause.] Men are judged by their reputations, and so far as I am concerned—and I do not reflect in the least on my distinguished colleagues on this committee—I have been a prosecuting attorney in my lifetime, and I never did allow a defendant's counsel to select the witnesses he would introduce and prescribe the procedure to which I was to be confined. And here it is being heralded from one end of this country to the other in our great daily press that Mr. Lawson, the man who has drawn the attention of the country to what I believe to be a myth, and who has shown himself in many instances to be an enigma to the great minds on this committee, so far as extracting anything material to the investigation of any probative value, on the train coming from New York to Washington had practically agreed to the employment of Samuel Untermyer to conduct this investigation. Investigate what? Lawson's side of the controversy, or the side of the country? The latter wants the truth to be known as to the vile insinuations against the highest officials connected with the public affairs of this country.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. Yes, sir.

Mr. FESS. Would the pending amendment exclude the employment of Mr. Untermyer?

Mr. HOWARD. No, sir. But I am putting out a feeler right now. [Laughter.] That is why I introduced the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HOWARD. May I have two minutes more?

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. HOWARD. I am putting out a feeler, and, if this House will back me, I will put in that resolution, "Provided further, That the services of Samuel Untermyer as attorney shall not be procured by this committee." [Applause.] There are other men in the country that know as much about stock exchanges as he. I can refer you to half a dozen of them.

Mr. GORDON. What does the gentleman think of the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE]?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that it is against the rules for a Member to sit in his seat and interrupt a Member who is speaking.

Mr. HOWARD. I do not mind answering, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. I know; but the Chair insists on order. That is a disorderly proceeding.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I suggest the gentleman make a comment on the suggestion that Charles E. Hughes, who has had vast experience, be employed by the committee.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I have been taught by my good mother to speak respectfully of the dead, and I must refrain from comment. [Laughter and applause.] There are plenty of attorneys—plenty of them—who will think \$10,000 for an investigation running over 15 or 20 days and the examination of probably 50 or 100 witnesses, thereby performing a patriotic duty to purify certain sources in this Government, if they are polluted, will be willing to take such a fee, from a patriotic standpoint, that will be reasonable and just. I am like the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]; I have always condemned the miserly and niggardly manner in which the Government of the United States has dealt with its district attorneys throughout this country, and I am not so much concerned about the size of the fee as I am about the character of the man who is to receive it.

And I believe that we ought to have in this particular instance men or a man to represent this committee of unquestioned integrity, a man at whom the finger of suspicion can not be pointed. This is an investigation of importance to the membership of this House, and we should not deal with it slightly. It involves the integrity of the very source of the Nation's Government, and if we permit men to act as attorneys for this committee, men whom the people could say were selected by the very man who brought about this investigation, to conduct it as he pleases, then we will surely be subject to the most severe and deserved criticism. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I believe that, so far as the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] are concerned, the employment as counsel for this committee of either Samuel Untermyer or Mr. Hughes would be an act of such gross impropriety that it will not be considered for a moment by the committee. [Applause.]

I do not favor the limitation of the amount which this committee may expend on counsel or expert fees. I hope and believe that a thorough investigation of this matter will show that no public official in high place has been guilty of what would be treason to the country and the people by betraying the trust reposed in him. [Applause.]

But there is suspicion in the air. There are rumors of all kinds going from mouth to mouth in this Chamber, in this city, and doubtless throughout the country. Not only ourselves but these officials ought to have a thorough investigation. If they should prove to be guilty, they ought to suffer. But it is for the honor of our country to ascertain whether they are guilty, in the hope that they may be proven innocent, and when this committee proceeds, with 30 days in which to make an investigation, and they employ counsel, they ought to have the right, when the trail apparently leads to some place, to have a lawyer follow it up and bring the testimony before the committee. They may need a dozen counsel. They may need dozens of experts. There is not a long time. It has to be done quickly. They should have every facility which can be afforded to them.

This is not a partisan matter, and you can not injure this country, our Government, by proof against a Democrat in high place without injuring all of us; you can not make proof against high officials of betrayal of trusts without injuring the country and all of us. I want to see an investigation, if there be no truth in these charges, which will show to the world that high officials in the American Government, a Government of the people, are not betraying their trust; or if they are, that they shall be punished.

I would not stop on the expenditure of paltry sums of money. It would be better to spend in a case like this and know the facts than to leave it to idle rumor and have no one believe the report of a committee. [Applause.] Whoever has a suspicion, let us find out, and I hope and pray in behalf of a Republic of the people that it will be shown that our officials have not betrayed their trust. [Applause.]

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call to the attention of the House the fact that the New York Stock Exchange has 1,100 members. There is a stock exchange firm for each member, except in about 100 instances, where there are two or more members of the stock exchange belonging to a firm. In a great many instances a firm—what we call a stock exchange house, that is, a firm engaged in stock exchange business, at least one of whose members is a member of the stock exchange—has branch houses scattered throughout the United States. Some of them have as high as 40 or 50 branches.

My own personal experience has taught me that the examination of a single stock broker's books, covering the accounts of a single active trader, will require the services of an expert accountant, taking one or two or three weeks, and will cost about \$250. If we undertake this investigation in the manner that Mr. Lawson asks that it be undertaken, according to his formula, we would have to have a corps of 1,000 expert accountants to finish it in 30 days.

Not only that, but after the expert accountants have gotten through with accumulating their detail you have got to take it and put it into a room where other experts can match together the evidence they have accumulated on this great fishing expedition. Are you going to get anywhere between now and the 4th day of March?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Will it take a thousand experts to examine the two whose names have been mentioned?

Mr. CALDWELL. No.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Well, that is all that has been suggested so far.

Mr. CALDWELL. If you take the suggestion of Mr. Lawson, who is reported as having stated in coming down on the train what counsel they are to employ, and who furnishes the formula, you will. Examine the record of Mr. Samuel Untermyer, you will find that for many years he has been endeavoring to get some kind of a legislative body to employ him to go on this

kind of a fishing excursion for his own or somebody else's benefit, not for the purpose of accumulating any evidence against any public official, because no man has found anything upon which he could base such a charge.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CALDWELL. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Is it not true that Mr. Untermyer accompanied the Secretary of the Treasury on his recent South American trip and has received honor from him?

Mr. CALDWELL. I do not know as to that.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is true. He was appointed by this administration to be one of the commissioners of the United States section of the International High Commission.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman from New York if Mr. Lawson did not state that Mr. Untermyer was not employed, but that he did see him on the train and talked with him in a general way only about this matter?

Mr. CALDWELL. I have repeated what I read in the newspaper reports. But I assure you in my opinion this kind of an investigation, followed along this line, will result not in an expenditure of \$15,000, not \$100,000, but as a matter of fact, perhaps \$250,000 before you got through with it, if you followed leads of this kind and went on this kind of a fishing excursion. I favor an investigation, not a fishing expedition for ulterior purposes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. POUL. Will the gentleman from Kansas yield some of his time?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution. It has been charged on the street, charged in the public press, charged on the stock exchange that members high in this Government have corruptly profited by advance information as to its action. To that charge has now been added, in the same locality, a more serious one, to the effect that the majority of this committee and the majority of this House do not desire to have these matters investigated and to ascertain whether the charge is in fact true.

Let me say at the outset that I place no credit in these charges, but at the same time the Committee on Rules owes it to itself and this House owes it to itself to have the truth or falsity of those charges shown and demonstrated and passed upon by some body other than that committee. Who ever heard of a committee being appointed to investigate charges which involved one of its members? True it is that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is not himself charged with having performed any corrupt act, but the charge made against him in the testimony is such that if true it would necessarily lead to the conclusion that he did not desire to pursue this investigation. Still this committee proposes to keep the investigation in its control and will proceed to conclusions upon which the gentleman from Texas will vote, as to whether this investigation shall be carried further.

With what the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said as to the manner in which this investigation ought to be conducted I entirely agree. But that is by a true investigating committee and not the Committee on Rules, which, to a certain extent, is itself the subject of investigation. My understanding is that the minority of the committee desire to have a special committee appointed. Who believes that any special committee will be appointed if this investigation is carried on in this manner? In my opinion they need no counsel to ascertain as to whether this investigation should be carried on not by themselves but by a special committee. For that reason I am opposed to this resolution in its entirety.

Mr. POUL. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. FIELDS].

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD]. This proposition has become of such importance that the committee in charge of the investigation should not be handicapped, and the House can not afford to have it handicapped for the sake of economy. While this question involves the reputation or the integrity of certain citizens of this country, it goes much further than that. It involves the integrity of the American Government because of the high official positions held by some of the parties whose names have been connected with it. Therefore, if the charges are true, the truth should be known. If they are untrue, as I believe they are and as I believe a thorough

investigation will disclose, it is due not only to the men whose names have been brought in question, but it is also due to the people of the United States that their names be cleared of these charges, because of the high official position that they hold. We have had many investigations in this country, but in my opinion this is the most important investigation of them all, not because of the merits of the charges which led to the adoption of the resolution directing the investigation, but because of the range which the investigation has taken, and I for one Member of this House am unwilling to handicap this committee in the name of economy, thereby rendering it unable to thoroughly sift the whole affair, without which it may not arrive at a proper conclusion. I disagree with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] who preceded me, and who contends that the Committee on Rules should not be permitted to go further with the investigation, but that a new committee should be appointed. These charges do not involve the names of any of the committee investigating them, and my confidence in the membership of the committee prompts me to believe that they will deal fairly with the evidence that is presented before the committee. Therefore I think the course taken by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is unjust to the Committee on Rules, and that his accusations are unwarranted. I hope in the interest of truth that this question, which has attracted the attention not only of the country but of the world, may be settled and settled right, which can not be done without a thorough investigation, which the Howard amendment would prevent. I therefore hope that this House will vote down the amendment and give the committee a free hand to make a thorough investigation, so that the truth and the whole truth may be fully known.

I am frank to say that I believe the charges are without foundation, and that the whole affair is a mean conspiracy designed to injure the reputations of certain men in high official positions by persons unfriendly to them or by "Wall Street" gamblers who have been robbed by other gamblers on the stock exchange, and who hope to precipitate a controversy which will result in an investigation of the stock exchange. Therefore the matter should not have received congressional notice. The Wood resolution should not have been adopted, but it was adopted by this House; and the very fact that it was makes it incumbent upon the House to go to the bottom of the charges which it contains. The House having dignified the charges and the resolution by notice and adoption can not now afford to permit itself to be charged with dereliction of duty in investigating same; having put its hand to the plow it can not now turn back, but must fully meet the responsibilities which it assumed by doing so or make itself ridiculous in the eyes of the country.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FIELDS. I do.

Mr. REAVIS. Does the gentleman believe that the chairman of the Committee on Rules, Mr. HENRY, will be enabled to weigh the testimony of the witness Lawson impartially and judicially?

Mr. FIELDS. I will say to the gentleman that the chairman of the Committee on Rules does not constitute the whole membership of that committee.

Mr. REAVIS. I am speaking with reference to a member of that committee. Do you believe that the chairman of that committee, under the circumstances, will be able judicially and impartially to weigh the testimony of the witness Lawson?

Mr. FIELDS. I will say that I think the chairman of the Committee on Rules is an honest man, and I believe that he would deal fairly with it from his point of view. I understand, of course, that because of certain phases of the controversy you might not be willing, or others might not be willing, to risk the chairman of the Committee on Rules to decide the whole question; but I want to repeat what I said, that the chairman does not constitute the whole committee, neither do I think that he, as a member of the committee, would participate in the weighing of any matter pertaining to the controversy between himself and the witness Lawson. He would leave questions of that character to the balance of the committee.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD].

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw the amendment offered by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman withdraws his amendment.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT].

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD], I wish to give expression to my convictions and my sentiments alone. Men are governed in their actions by their environment and by their knowledge of situations and conditions, and before this Congress I wish to go on record

to-day on this question. I want to say, gentlemen, that I believe this is a most colossal farce and that we are being imposed upon as no legislative body ever has been anywhere on earth. [Applause.] I believe that not for one minute does any Member of this Congress or any sensible, sane man who has knowledge of the methods of Wall Street and of men like Lawson, believe Mr. HENRY is guilty of any wrong. [Applause.] Nor do they believe that any member of the Cabinet is guilty of any wrong, or that any United States Senator is guilty of any wrong. Let me tell you why this appears to me to be such a monstrous farce. I understand that this investigation is based upon a so-called leak. What leak? A leak that the President was in favor of peace? How absurd to anyone who knows the roosters of Wall Street. Why, my friends, did not the President of the United States, early in December, declare from that stand that within a week—yea, perhaps within a day—this country might become involved in war; that, in fact, the sparks were sputtering about us then? Did the market break as a consequence of this deliverance? No; it was not rigged to break. The market breaks only when it is rigged to break. It breaks only when the country suckers are on board long, and then Wall Street waits for the opportunity. The opportunity came. [Applause.] When the market goes up, it is when the country suckers are short, and they are given the squeeze. The one thing above all other things that convinces me that this is a farce, that we ought to wash our hands not only of this amendment but that we ought to throw it all into the street as damaged, worthless goods and beneath the dignity of this self-respecting legislative body—the one thing among others which convinces me that this is a fake and sham and travesty is not only the fact that around Wall Street many of Mr. Lawson's performances are regarded counterfeit, but because it is alleged that somebody "outside" and in Washington made money on the leak, for Wall Street never allows anybody "outside" to make any money.

To save the time of Congress, to maintain our self-respect, and to save the people's money let us dismiss this whole unwarranted and unmerited investigation and consign it to the garbage can, where it belongs. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, if there is any motion in order that will lead to the dismissal of this whole proceeding, I desire to make it. [Applause.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. CANDLER] three minutes.

Mr. CANDLER of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, while some persons may be inclined to some extent to agree with some of the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT], who has just preceded me, we all must recognize the fact that this House, by unanimous consent, only a few days ago sent these resolutions now pending before the House back to that committee with instructions to further investigate. The investigation has gone to that extent that it is believed it is necessary to go further, and this morning, by unanimous consent of this House, the committee was granted 30 days' additional time to make a full and complete and thorough investigation of all the charges, complaints, and insinuations connected with this whole affair.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe we mean what we say and are in real earnest about this investigation; and if so, there should be no limitation placed on this committee, upon its powers of investigation, or upon the funds to be used by it in making the investigation. Whether there is anything in the charges or not is to be determined, but there is no question but what they are floating around from one end of the country to the other, and headlines in the newspapers indicate that they permeate not only the cities, the towns, and hamlets, but are traveling up and down every rural route in this land. When these charges, suggestions, and insinuations of wrongdoing go out to the people of this country, not only the honor and integrity of the membership of the House is involved and the good name and fair fame of every Member sitting in this body, but Cabinet officers and other people are involved; and the duty now confronting us is to see that no obstructions are put in the way of a full, complete, searching, and unsparing investigation being made, to the end that the flood light of truth be turned on in all its power. [Applause.] I want them to have authority and money to go to the very deepest depths of the whole thing, and expose the roots of every charge, dig them up to the fullest extent, and if there is anything wrong, expose every particle of wrong and corruption, and lay on and spare not. The innocent have nothing to fear and the guilty, if there be any, deserve no consideration. "The wicked flee when no man pursueth; but the righteous are as bold as a lion." The innocent will stand and

welcome this investigation, and if the wicked attempt to flee give this committee money and authority to pursue and catch them. If there is nothing in these charges, let that be demonstrated and satisfy the people throughout the land. If there is anything in them, let the people have the truth, and whoever is the guilty party let it be known that punishment may be visited upon him. It is just as important to the people that the innocent against whom these charges are made should be vindicated as it is to find those who are guilty. Therefore, again I say, give the committee full authority and necessary funds, and say to them, "Go to it!" Let no guilty man escape, high or low, and remove every doubt as to the innocent. Dissipate the clouds and let in the sunshine and make happy the innocent and make miserable the guilty, if there be any guilty. [Great applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN] is opposed to this resolution because in his opinion any further investigation should be conducted by a special committee and not by the Committee on Rules. I want to remind the gentleman from Iowa and this side of the House that whatever opinion he may entertain in that respect that matter is not within the control of either the minority members of the committee or of this side of the House. The majority members of the Committee on Rules have determined that they will proceed further with the investigation. The minority members have agreed that there should be further investigation. Every Member of this House, in view of what has transpired, must also agree to that. It is not within our power to say that a special committee shall be created. That lies on that side of the aisle, and we are therefore left with this proposition: The investigation will be continued by the Committee on Rules. Shall it be continued longer without the benefit of counsel? And that is the only question there is before the House to-day.

Mr. EMERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I will.

Mr. EMERSON. I would like to hear in all fairness why a committee with such good lawyers as the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] on that committee, the committee should be in need of requiring the aid of counsel.

Mr. LENROOT. I was just coming to that, and would have come to it without the gentleman's question. That is a perfectly proper and pertinent question and I am glad to state the reason as far as I am concerned.

With me it is not primarily for counsel in order to gain information concerning the intricacies of the New York Stock Exchange, but this is the proposition: The names of certain men have now become involved in this proceeding. Presumably these men will come before the committee, and presumably these men will testify that they are absolutely innocent. Presumably that is the fact, but the country is not going to be satisfied with any general denial upon the part of any witness coming before that committee. The country is not going to be satisfied unless there is a proper cross-examination of that man, we have gotten the truth, whatever it may be.

Now, the members of the Committee on Rules are not the proper ones to make that cross-examination. If the minority members of the committee make it—if they make such an examination as ought to be made, they will at once be charged with being actuated by partisan motives in the questions they ask. They will have to, if they desire to get at the truth, assume the rôle of prosecuting counsel. They ought not to be called upon to do it. Presumably the majority members of the committee in the questions they ask of the witnesses will ask such questions as will support the claim of innocence, and they will bear the rôle of counsel for the defense.

Mr. Speaker, that ought not to be done on either side, but we ought to have counsel, not selected by the Democratic members alone, not selected by the Republican members alone, but counsel of eminence in the United States, a man who has not been active partisan in either Republican or Democratic politics, a man who will serve the Committee on Rules not with the idea of prosecuting or shielding any man, but only to get at the truth, wherever it may lie, and be free to ask any question of that witness that will either draw out the guilt, if guilt there be, or support by corroborative evidence the innocence of the man before the committee.

Mr. ANDERSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I will.

Mr. ANDERSON. Has the gentleman any hopes of securing such a man?

Mr. LENROOT. I have. I believe there are counsel of that kind in the United States.

Mr. ANDERSON. I have no doubt there are counsel, but on account of the rumors that are going around the House, and in view of the debate we have had here to-day, I have very serious doubts about the committee securing such counsel.

Mr. LENROOT. With reference to Mr. Undermyer, I want to say for the committee on both sides, Republicans and Democrats, that there has not been the slightest suggestion by any member of the committee that Mr. Undermyer shall be employed. I want to say to the Democratic side of the House that if this resolution shall pass and if the counsel that is employed shall not be satisfactory to the Republican members of the committee, if he shall be known as a partisan of this administration, if there is the slightest suspicion that the examination he shall conduct will be had for the purpose of shielding anybody, the purpose of this resolution will fail. But I believe it will be possible for both Republicans and Democrats to agree upon some counsel who will not only have the confidence of the membership of this House upon both sides of the aisle, but the confidence of the country as well, so that when our examinations are concluded this House and the country will feel that we have got the truth, whatever it may be.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. I understand the purpose of this inquiry is to ascertain if any officials holding official positions with our Government were guilty of giving advance information of governmental action by reason of which they or others profited upon the stock market.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. Is it necessary, in order to ascertain that fact, that there be an investigation of the whole New York Stock Exchange?

Mr. LENROOT. I think not; and, so far as I am concerned, there has not been any suggestion of that purpose so far as the Committee on Rules is concerned.

Mr. MILLER of Minnesota. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDWELL] seemed to advance that idea.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Wisconsin will permit me to answer the gentleman's question, the reason I said that was because Mr. Lawson, in putting down his scheme by which he was going to find out who was guilty, suggested if they brought in the books they could find who was guilty. He gave what he called a formula by which he was going to find who was crooked in the administration, and if you follow his formula you have to make that investigation.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I can not yield further. I will simply say that, so far as the preparation of this resolution is concerned, the reason for the employment of counsel and an accountant was not with an idea that this committee would make any general investigation of the New York Stock Exchange.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. REAVIS. If this resolution should pass, is it the purpose of this committee to make the investigation or to determine whether an investigation should be had?

Mr. LENROOT. I can only speak for myself and, I believe, for my associates upon the minority side of the committee. Our view is that there ought to be an investigation now by a special committee, because of the peculiar conditions which now exist and surround this entire matter. Secondly, our position will continue to be that the moment from now on there is any evidence establishing a prima facie case within the subject matter of this resolution this Committee on Rules should suspend its investigation and report the resolution to the House for the creation of a special committee.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman feels at liberty to answer such a question, I should like to ask whether he feels that he has substantial grounds for a belief that he himself and other minority members of the Committee on Rules will receive consideration, substantial consideration, in the choice of counsel, or will their views be largely neglected?

Mr. LENROOT. I have not, nor do I think my associates have, received that impression, because it has not yet reached that point in the discussion, but I think I can safely say to the gentleman from Michigan that the majority members of this committee, when it comes to the selection of counsel, will not select any counsel who is not satisfactory to the minority members of the committee, because the moment they do they will add to the suspicion that already exists throughout the country, and

if that suspicion be unfounded, then this committee as a whole ought to do its best to remove it.

Mr. RAGSDALE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit a question?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I yield four minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to give my entire approbation and support to every honest effort to find all the facts in connection with these accusations. I felt a good deal like the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOCHT] all during this matter. I felt at times that I would like to close the whole matter by repeating a sentence of David's prayer, and say, "Let lying lips be put to silence that speak grievous things falsely and contemptuously against the righteous"; but the matter has gone on until now there is no reason in stopping. I am in favor of the present committee continuing its investigations until they find overt acts and prima facie facts upon which they can make a tangible report. I do not want to substitute a new committee for the present committee at this time, for they will have to begin back at the beginning and start up and fish and smell a week or two before they find anything like what this committee knows. I want to continue the investigation until some specific condition is developed, and so far as the chairman of the committee, the Hon. R. L. HENRY, being discolored by Lawson's foul, exuding stench, I just want to suggest that if you create another committee, then that social, political, and commercial polecat that maliciously fumed that stench on HENRY could blow his breath on the new chairman and discolor him at once as he has this chairman. [Laughter.] So I am in favor of going on with the investigation and I am not sticking about the amount of money. If you expend \$100,000 to vindicate the honor, stability, character, and official integrity of prominent and national characters, which are at stake, who now, in my opinion, suffer under the rancor of irresponsible rumor and slander, the money will be well spent. Let us develop the truth. If there is no official turpitude, then let these slanders stand to convict the men who uttered them as infamous. [Applause.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Do I understand the gentleman is not going to use any more of his time?

Mr. POU. No.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have a little time left on this side, but it is not important.

Mr. POU. I will withhold the motion if the gentleman desires.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The gentleman may make the motion, with this suggestion.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. POU, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

#### PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the House will automatically resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18994, the public-buildings bill, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CLINE] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the public-buildings bill, with Mr. CLINE in the chair.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] in charge of the bill is not present. I wish to know how much time the gentleman from Florida has used and how much I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida has 60 minutes left; the gentleman from Ohio has 1 hour and 20 minutes left.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT].

Mr. GILLETT. Mr. Chairman, by the admission of this administration there will be during the next year a deficiency of about \$300,000,000, and by the military-defense program which we have marked out for ourselves extraordinary taxation to meet that deficit and perhaps bond issues are likely to continue for several years. Obviously, then, it is a time when the Government ought to be prudent and sparing in all its routine expenses. Necessities, of course, we should not neglect; we can

afford to keep house in a moderate, perhaps in a generous way, but we certainly can not afford luxuries. Now, it seems to me that nobody can deny that the greater part of the buildings provided by this bill are pure luxuries. And they are not only luxuries, they are extravagant luxuries. Nobody, I think, claims that the post-office administration needs these buildings to carry on its business well, but, on the contrary, the very enactment of this law and the very construction of these buildings will increase the expenses of the Post Office administration.

Under the law no building can be built where there is less than \$10,000 postal receipts. That law shows that in the opinion of Congress and the committee the necessity for the building is dependent on the size of the postal receipts, and yet, in a great majority of the post offices, where the receipts are over \$10,000 the records show that they are now paying for rent, light, heat, and service less than \$1,000 a year. Simply to operate the cheaper buildings of \$50,000 costs nearly twice that, without including the cost of the building or interest on investment. Therefore if you put in these buildings you increase the current expenses of the department. Now, we all know this bill is not brought in here to improve the post-office efficiency. It is brought in largely to improve congressional fences. It is not peculiar to this committee; it has always been so. These public-building bills are brought in the interest of Members.

My colleague [Mr. GARDNER] on yesterday suggested that he voted for the rule because he hoped that the House would strike out the unnecessary items, and then he could vote for the bill. I do not believe any man in the House shared that hope, because as soon as you strike out one item the bill loses one vote, and if you keep on striking out unnecessary items you keep losing votes until at last there will not be enough enthusiasm for the bill to call for the yeas and nays. You can not amend, improve, and perfect a bill when each Member is personally interested in it, because we are none of us impartial to the matters which affect our personal interests.

The very way in which this bill was prepared shows that it was not prepared for the public interest. It was prepared for the private interest of Congressmen. The chairman of the committee last year sent out letters to every Congressman suggesting that he send in an item for the bill. Is that the way the other committees go to work? Is that the way any appropriation bill would be prepared?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILLETT. Certainly, I will yield if the gentleman will give me time. The gentleman has plenty of time, I believe.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have not.

Mr. GILLETT. Then I will have to wait and see if I have the time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I wanted to ask the gentleman a question. I presume the gentleman does not want to make a misstatement?

Mr. GILLETT. No; I am glad to have a correction if I have made a misstatement.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I sent out no such letters as that.

Mr. GILLETT. I received one.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I sent out letters asking the gentlemen to indicate what place in their district they thought was entitled to more consideration than the others when the committee made up its bill.

Mr. GILLETT. I forget the phraseology of the suggestion which was sent in, but what did the gentleman do in preparing his bill? Suppose a Member of Congress thought that under the present condition of the Treasury no public-buildings bill would be passed this year. Did the gentleman's committee then consider that district, or, contrary, if no suggestion was made by the Congressman, did he ask the Post Office Department what place in that district should be appropriated for, or, on the contrary, did he entirely neglect the district? I say there are districts where no public buildings are provided for in this bill, and yet which have cities of 10,000 and 20,000 inhabitants without post offices, whereas to the friends, the favorite Members, there are scattered broadcast buildings for small villages of two or three thousand.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will permit me, I will state—

Mr. GILLETT. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Those districts are not provided for because the Members from the districts for some reason or other did not look after the interest of the districts.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman just corrected me a moment ago by saying that they only asked Members which of the places in their district they thought should be the favored one.

Now, the gentleman is apparently intimating that he asked Members whether they should have one or not.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I asked them that when they had more than one bill pending.

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman asked them when they did not have any bill pending. The gentleman sent it to every Congressman and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It may have been sent indiscriminately to everybody on the assumption that Members of Congress would look after the interests of their respective districts.

Mr. GILLETT. If the gentleman is looking after the business of the Nation and not simply looking after the interests of Congressmen why does he not look after each district, and when there is no suggestion from a Congressman, when he has not suggested one rather than another, why does not he find out from the Post Office Department what is needed?

The truth is, the gentleman knows and we all know it was intended to make a combination of Congressmen. Now, I do not like to use, and I do not use, and I do not like to hear others use, these words "graft" and "pork" in connection with Congress. I think we are a great deal better men than the public generally thinks we are, and yet I think it is bills like this, bills which appeal to the private interests of the Congressmen rather than to the public interest of the Nation, that make the people credulous and readily believe such unsubstantiated attacks as are now being investigated. I believe there ought to be a new system and method of making up these bills. I admit this has always been the method, but this limitation of \$10,000 of receipts is ridiculously lax. It is more economical for the Post Office Department to rent buildings than it is to erect them until the business of the city or town gets so large that it needs a whole building for itself.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit me to answer that question?

Mr. GILLETT. If you will give me time; otherwise I can not.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I can do it in this time if you will take it now.

Mr. GILLETT. I can not yield to the gentleman unless he gives me time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. All right; I have not got it.

Mr. GILLETT. You have plenty of time.

What we ought to do, in my opinion, is not to pass a bill for any town until a special building is required for the post-office business. When a special building is required it is time enough for us to say that we will erect buildings, but otherwise let us rent. That is business; that is economy. Now, I have no doubt that such a rule is too rigid to meet the views of a majority in this House, but in my opinion in business administration the time is coming when such a rule will have to be adopted, and it seems to me that the danger of the present practice is vividly illustrated in this very bill. I can not believe that those who are responsible for the financial condition of the Treasury to-day will allow it to become a law. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to give some of the reasons why I am opposed to this bill and why I shall vote against it. I am a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and have been for the past six years, but I had nothing whatever to do with the making up of this bill. I expressed myself, however, as opposed to an omnibus bill on numerous occasions in the committee, and when the committee finally determined to report a bill declined to further participate in its consideration. Chairman CLARK told you the bill was the sentiment and best judgment of the committee, with possibly one or two members opposed. I violate no confidence when I say at least three members of the committee have been steadfastly opposed to this bill, and I know there are several other members on the committee who doubt seriously the wisdom of passing this bill. The bill, however, is doubtless favored by a majority of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and I claim no irregularity in any respect. I dislike very much to disagree with my colleagues on the committee, for whom I have the highest regard and who have always treated me with the greatest consideration, and none to a greater degree than the charming chairman of the committee.

I wish to concur in the statement of the chairman that this bill is not sectional. I doubt if there is a committee of the House where partisan prejudice is less manifest. It is unfair, therefore, for anyone who is opposed to the bill to charge that it is sectional. Republicans have had just as generous a piece of pie as the Democrats. In fact, the boys have all been pretty well cared for, and that is what makes it difficult to defeat a bill of this character. To vote against this bill means a vote

against a piece of bacon for the folks back home for at least two-thirds of the Members of this body.

The chairman referred to certain gentlemen who heretofore have favored this sort of legislation but who are now violently opposed to it, intimating that it was because they had secured all the public buildings they desired for their district. I did not oppose the public-buildings bill four years ago, and would not oppose this bill now if the conditions were the same as they were at that time, although there are towns in this bill that have as little need for a public building as a pig has for two tails. I have an item in this bill, although I did not ask for it, for a town which now has 14,000 population, and whose postal receipts for the past year were over \$30,000. It is a better proposition than at least 150 items in this bill. I have four other towns in my district that do not have a Government building which are fully equal to 100 of the items in this bill. The shoe flung by the chairman does not, therefore, fit me. I expect to vote against the bill, and will vote to strike out all items which have no more merit than the one from my district. But, like the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], I will not offer an amendment to strike out the item for my district unless all items of like merit go out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman says he will not move to strike out the item in which he is interested.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Unless all like items are stricken out.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the question that is troubling me. How are we to determine which is the best item? The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] says he will not strike out his item because it is a proper one, and the gentleman from Ohio says he will not strike out his item because it is a proper one; and how are we to distinguish between the propriety of these items except as the committee recommends them?

Mr. ASHBROOK. If the gentleman will offer an amendment to the bill to strike out all the items where the postal receipts do not exceed \$35,000, which will include my item, I will vote for it.

Mr. BURNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will.

Mr. BURNETT. How many items has the gentleman had in that bill since he has been in Congress?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Well, I have been cared for pretty well. I will refer to that before I conclude my remarks.

Mr. BURNETT. You will state that, then, before you get through?

Mr. ASHBROOK. If I do not, I am perfectly willing the gentleman should.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Has the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds ever considered passing this kind of a law, namely, to fix the conditions under which public buildings shall be erected, as to the income of a post office, the size of the town, and whether they have free delivery or not? After that the erection of public buildings would be purely an automatic performance. Is it possible to do it and get this method out of here?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will say to the gentleman that in the last public-buildings bill the limitation was made at \$6,000 receipts, I believe, and in this bill it is fixed at \$10,000 postal receipts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I know; but this bill and the other bill did not make the thing work automatically.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If the gentleman will permit, the committee has never considered the proposition of fixing a limit of receipts or any other standard by which buildings could be constructed automatically.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I am driving at is this: Is it possible to rig up a law like that, that will take this everlasting squabble out of the House?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think it is. So far as I am concerned, I would be perfectly willing to do so.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I can hardly conceive how a law of that kind could be passed, because it would be impossible for the Government to build public buildings for all the towns that would be entitled to a building under a limitation we most likely would fix.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Why?

Mr. ASHBROOK. For instance, if we should fix the postal receipts at \$15,000 or \$25,000, it would be impossible for the Government, within a considerable number of years, to build public buildings at all the towns that would meet this requirement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Suppose we say \$15,000 or \$25,000? It does not make any difference where the limit is, so that you can get a law that relieves the House of this continual squabble and from being slandered by every newspaper that wants to slander it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The only way that could be handled would be by fixing the postal receipts so high, say \$50,000, that it would not include two-thirds of the items that come in these omnibus building bills. Such a bill in my judgment would not be popular with the Members.

Mr. BORLAND. If the gentleman will permit?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Certainly.

Mr. BORLAND. The suggestion that is made that a law might be passed fixing conditions under which a public building could be constructed, and then permit them to be constructed automatically, would require, of course, an affirmative action of some executive officer, and then it would also require that he have control of an appropriation sufficient to construct the building or else he would have to simply report to Congress the number of buildings that he had decided that year came within the conditions, and leaving Congress then to make the appropriation at that time for the construction of the buildings. It would not get around the question of the authorization by law for the appropriation of public money.

Mr. ASHBROOK. And in that event it would work out as most of these things do along that line, the gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol would get most of the buildings.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. SHERLEY. There is another matter that is of importance other than the question of rental. That is the question of the type of building. Has it been considered. I know of some instances where buildings have been erected, costing a great deal of money, buildings which, although handsome, were not in keeping from an architectural standpoint with their environments. It was like putting a string of pearls around the neck of a woman who has on shoes with holes in them. [Laughter.]

Mr. ASHBROOK. Along the line of the standardization of public buildings, there is legislation in this bill which I believe would remedy the condition to which you refer.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield again right there?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. There is a box type of building which is now proposed which would answer the purpose very well.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I think the committee deserves the thanks of Congress for doing that, and it would be a good thing, also, to set a limit for the sites.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say that in this bill we have drawn no distinctions between sites and buildings, but have fixed the same limit—\$10,000—for both sites and buildings, requiring that the city or town show \$10,000 of receipts for three successive years.

Mr. ASHBROOK. A man perhaps is justified in buying a twin six if the condition of his exchequer will warrant it, but if he must put a mortgage on his home to buy the speeder he would be a very poor business man, to say the least. A Ford ought to be his limit. A man may have bought a diamond ring and a sealskin coat for his wife when he was flush, but he would be a very foolish man, indeed, to make expenditures of this kind when he was hard pressed for the necessities of life. Because certain Members did not oppose public buildings 4, 6, and 10 years ago is no argument why they should now favor a bill authorizing appropriations of upwards of \$40,000,000 when we have a deficit of \$300,000,000 staring us in the face and we know not where or how to raise the money.

There are numerous items in this bill which can be defended by all. It is not wholly a bad bill, but there are items in this bill making authorizations for villages which had less than 1,000 population, according to the census returns of 1910, to wit, Susanville, Cal., population 688; Baxley, Ga., 831; Hazard, Ky., 537; Las Vegas, Nev., 945—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for another question?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman is a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, is he not?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman knew that the subcommittees were engaged in these hearings, did he not?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will ask the gentleman if he attended any of those hearings and objected to the insertion of any of these items in this bill?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I want to say to the chairman of the committee—and if I do not assert the truth, I ask him to rise in his place and dispute it—that upon every occasion during this Congress when an omnibus public buildings bill was proposed and suggested I opposed it, and when the committee finally determined to report a bill I gave notice that I would not attend the hearings, and did not participate in making up this bill. Is that true?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That is true; but does not the gentleman think he ought to have attended those hearings as a member of the committee, and ought to have done what he could to keep out objectionable items?

Mr. BURNETT. And was not the gentleman chairman of one of the subcommittees?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes; but declined to act as such. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, in answer to the query of my friend from Florida [Mr. CLARK] that I do not waste my ammunition in trying to bring down birds out of range and reach. You had too many votes in the committee to make it worth my time to attempt to oppose this bill. I demanded a roll call on several occasions to determine the temper of the committee, and when I found the temper of the committee was to report a bill I acted as I have stated.

At Lewisburg, W. Va., there is a population of 803; at Berkeley Springs, W. Va., 864—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will not the gentleman be fair enough to state that a term of the Federal court is held at Lewisburg, W. Va., and we provided for a courthouse there as well as the post office?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Well, if that is true, I am perfectly willing to have the gentleman interrupt me to make the statement. It is a town, however, of 864 inhabitants.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Does not the gentleman know that I got a building at Berkeley Springs, and that that is in my district?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Well, I dislike to oppose anything in which the gentleman is so much interested.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Did you not help me get that bill through?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I think not. If the gentleman had listened to my statement, he would not say so.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Do you not think that there should be a Federal building at a place where 5,000 people get their mail and live within a certain radius of the place?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I doubt that. I know that 864 people are said to live in this village.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Did you not attend the hearings on that item?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Did I attend the hearings?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. Yes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I do not think I had anything to do with the making up of this bill.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. I beg the gentleman's pardon. Does not the gentleman remember Judge Boyce and his brother, who appeared before the committee, and also Mr. RUCKER? Mr. RUCKER is a native of Lewisburg.

Mr. ASHBROOK. How long ago was that?

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. About a year, perhaps.

Mr. ASHBROOK. If the gentleman says it is true, I will not dispute it.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. I want to say that there are two colleges in that town.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It is a growing town, no doubt. Lewisburg, W. Va., 803; Berkeley Springs, W. Va., 864; and Newcastle, Wyo., 975. The postal receipts at Susanville for the last fiscal year were \$7,058.08.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there for just one moment?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does not the gentleman know that at Susanville, Cal., there is a post office, a land office, a court-house, and a station of the Forest Service to be housed?

Mr. ASHBROOK. How much is the rental for those activities?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, I can tell you later. I do not know it just now, but we are building a building there to take care of the Federal activities of the Government. The gentleman knows it has always been customary not to follow the rule of postal receipts when there are other Federal activities, and here are four or five to be taken care of.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Well, the gentleman knows that those activities are not of great importance. If there is a court there it would be more important.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the gentleman think that a United States land office is not important?

Mr. ASHBROOK. It is the most important of those activities.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. It may be very important, and yet it could be perfectly well taken care of in a rented building.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes. I doubt whether all of these Federal activities would amount in rental to more than \$1,000. I may be mistaken but—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The Government ought to have a building there.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. JAMES. The amount of rental for the post office activities at Susanville is \$600 a year.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I suppose that is for the post office.

For Baxley, \$6,639.50; for Hazard, \$4,447.43; for Las Vegas, \$7,198.68; for Lewisburg, \$8,017.37; for Berkeley Springs, \$6,485.23; and New Castle, \$4,174.70. This bill authorizes \$10,000 for a site at Susanville, and the Treasury Department estimates the maintenance of the public building would be \$4,800 per annum. The rental is now \$600.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What does the bill carry for Baxley, Ga.? I will say to the gentleman, to save his time, that it carries \$5,000 for a site, and that is within the law, is it not, the postal receipts being over \$6,000?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I do not question that it is within the law as passed in the last public building bill, but at this time I do not like the law.

Mr. BURNETT. And the gentleman voted for that bill, did he not?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I believe I voted with my friend at that time. I have listened very generally to my friend, and often voted with him. But I will say to him that—

While the lamp holds out to burn  
The vilest sinner may return.

Mr. BURNETT. That applies to the gentleman, I suppose, not to myself.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It might, of course, and will work as well one way as the other no doubt. However, we are occupying different pews at this time.

Mr. BURNETT. I see—you are.

Mr. ASHBROOK. At Baxley \$5,000 is authorized for the site; estimated upkeep \$4,200, the rental now \$480. At Hazard \$40,000 is estimated for a building, the site, I believe, having already been acquired; estimated upkeep \$3,800, rental now \$240. At Las Vegas \$5,000 is authorized for a site, estimated upkeep \$5,100, and the Government now pays no rental at this town.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit me to state that a newspaper published at Hazard, Ky., was sent to me showing that they have over 1,000 voters in the town of Hazard to-day.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I received a copy of the newspaper referred to, which is not published at Hazard but at Lexington, but it may be that the conditions are similar to those mentioned by my friend from West Virginia [Mr. LITTLEPAGE], that if you take in a radius of two or three miles from the town the number of people is larger.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman may.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. I see that in the hearings on the Lewisburg post office the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] asked certain questions. Does the gentleman now recall being there?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I made no denial, although I do not remember. I stated if the gentleman said I was present at the hearings, I accepted his statement; but he said the hearings were held a year or so ago.

Mr. LITTLEPAGE. All right.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I do not think I promised my friend from West Virginia that I would favor his bill, though. At Lewisburg \$82,000 is authorized, estimated upkeep \$6,800, rental now \$540; at Berkeley Springs, \$10,000 is authorized for a site, estimated upkeep \$3,700, rental now \$450; at Newcastle \$25,000, estimated upkeep \$3,800. The Government pays no rental at Newcastle.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield.

Mr. RANDALL. I understand publications like Collier's Weekly and the Saturday Evening Post have denominated this a pork-barrel bill. Is that correct?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will leave it to the gentleman to draw his own conclusion as to the character of this bill, but believe the magazines have so designated it.

Mr. RANDALL. I believe that is correct, that various publications, including Collier's Weekly and the Saturday Evening Post, have denominated this a pork-barrel bill. Now, is it not true that the Postmaster General and various commissions which have investigated the cost of carrying these papers in the mails have stated that the net loss on the carriage of the Saturday Evening Post, for instance, is about \$5,000,000 a year out of the Treasury? Would that be pork, in the gentleman's opinion?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am not discussing the Saturday Evening Post or Collier's Weekly or second-class postal rates. The gentleman is free to form any opinion that he chooses on that question. I do not quite understand why we should issue bonds to provide public buildings for the villages mentioned.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman a question right there?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does not the gentleman think it would really be more in accord with good sense to knock out one or two battalions that we do not need and put up some buildings that we do need?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am in favor of erecting public buildings where there is absolute necessity for them, and the gentleman knows that I have been in favor during the past Congress of reporting out bills that would stand on their own legs.

In this bill there are 118 items for towns which had less than \$10,000 postal receipts for the last fiscal year. Nine of these have less than 5,000 population, to wit, Attalla, Ala.; Eminence, Ky.; Barbourville, Ky.; our old friend, Hazard, Ky.; Owenton, Ky.; Huntingdon, Tenn.; Nephi, Utah; Green River, Wyo.; and Newcastle, Wyo. At three of these villages the Government now pays no rental.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does not the gentleman know, having been a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for several years, that that committee has never attached a great deal of importance to population, but that it has been controlled practically by the business done at the post office; in other words, the annual postal receipts?

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is true, but all of these towns mentioned have very small postal receipts, as the gentleman will find if he will examine the same. There are eight villages provided for by this kind committee where the postal receipts are less than \$6,000 per annum, to wit: Albertville, Ala.; Central City, Ky.; Falmouth, Ky.; Perryville, Mo.; Mount Olive, N. C.; Bamberg, S. C.; Easley, S. C.; Manning, S. C.; LaFollette, Tenn.; West Point, Va.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Now, if the gentleman will pardon me, there is a customhouse at West Point.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Can the gentleman advise me of the amount of the customs receipts at that point?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I can not, but there is a customs office there.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I accept the gentleman's statement as a fact. At three of these thriving towns no rent is paid by good Uncle Sam. Twenty-eight towns in this bill are provided either sites or buildings where the postal receipts for the past fiscal year were less than \$7,000, to wit: Ozark, Ala.; Brinkley, Ark.; Monticello, Fla.; Perry, Fla.; Ashburn, Ga.; Baxley, Ga.; Blakely, Ga.; Commerce, Ga.; Jackson, Ga.; Pelham, Ga.; Thomaston, Ga.; Murray, Ky.; Pikeville, Ky.; Stanford, Ky.; Ellicott City, Md.; Okolona, Miss.; Pascagoula, Miss.; Unionville, Mo.; Milan, Mo.; Salem, Mo.; Clinton, N. C.; Williamston, N. C.; Waurika, Okla.; Conway, S. C.; Greer, S. C.; Rockwood, Tenn.; Lenoir, Tenn.; Henderson, Tex.; Berkeley Springs, W. Va.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the gentleman mean that buildings were provided for those places?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Either buildings or sites.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, the gentleman knows that under the law we are permitted to provide sites where places have receipts of \$6,000 a year. I want to state that Monticello, Fla., has more than \$6,000 receipts, and I think every one of the towns the gentleman has mentioned has more than \$6,000 annual postal receipts.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I have the statement of the Post Office Department which, I believe, is for the last fiscal year. If that is incorrect, it is an error on the part of the Post Office Department. I have used the figures furnished me. I believe the gentleman also has the figures before him.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the gentleman mean to say we have provided sites for places whose postal receipts are less than \$6,000, the places that he is naming now?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am now naming towns where the postal receipts are \$7,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Less than \$7,000?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes. I am in that class now.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. That may be true.

Mr. ASHBROOK. There also appears to be 28 fine, growing villages cared for in this bill where the postal receipts for the past fiscal year were under \$8,000, to wit: Sylacauga, Ala.; Union Springs, Ala.; Sheffield, Ala.; sister Susanville, Cal., before mentioned; Monroe, Ga.; Sandersville, Ga.; Waynesboro, Ga.; Cairo, Ga.; Covington, Ga.; Cuthbert, Ga.; Decatur, Ga.; Winder, Ga.; Carrollton, Ill.; Marengo, Iowa; Pineville, Ky.; Laurel, Md.; Indianola, Miss.; Paris, Mo.; Salisbury, Mo.; Eldorado Springs, Mo.; Rich Hill, Mo.; Windsor, Mo.; Las Vegas, Nev.; Dillon, S. C.; Summerville, S. C.; Rogersville, Tenn.; Dickson, Tenn.; and Crockett, Tex.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Certainly.

Mr. POWERS. I believe the gentleman mentioned Pineville, Ky.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes; I did.

Mr. POWERS. And he stated that the postal receipts were less than \$8,000.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I did.

Mr. POWERS. I want to say that the postal receipts for Pineville in 1916 were over \$9,000.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The receipts seem to be growing nicely.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The receipts for the fiscal year of 1916 were \$9,144.68. The last quarter's receipts show that it will go beyond \$10,000 this next fiscal year.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am quoting from figures furnished me by the Treasury Department.

Mr. BURNETT. And those are for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916.

Mr. ASHBROOK. That is true, I believe.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman got his figures from the Treasury Department?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I did.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. These I am reading are from the Post Office Department, who know much better as to the receipts than the Treasury Department.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am willing that the gentleman should read from any figures that suit him best, but I assume the Post Office Department furnished the figures to the Treasury Department.

Mr. BORLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I will.

Mr. BORLAND. Perhaps the gentleman will come to it later, but has he made any estimate of the gross amount included in this bill that, according to his opinion as a member of the committee, ought not to be included, so that we may compare the gross amount he thinks is unauthorized with the balance of the bill?

Mr. ASHBROOK. There are an even 200 items where the postal receipts are less than \$15,000.

Mr. BORLAND. How much do they aggregate in the total amount of \$38,000,000?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I have not figured that out.

Mr. BORLAND. My understanding is that there is less than \$6,000,000 that could be subject to criticism. Is that true?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I have not figured the amount; I can not say. Of course, that is a mere bagatelle.

I find 20 towns snugly tucked away in this bill with less than \$9,000 postal receipts for the past fiscal year, to wit: Essex, Conn.; Rossville, Ga.; Hawkinsville, Ga.; Lewiston, Ill.; Hickman, Ky.; Russellville, Ky.; Morgan City, La.; De Riddle, La.; Clare, Mich.; Eaton Rapids, Mich.; Lexington, Miss.; Winona,

Miss.; Bowling Green, Mo.; O'Neill, Nebr.; Ely, Nev.—who seems to belong to the old and well-known family of Get-There-Ely—Albemarle, N. C.; Louisburg, N. C.; Marvin, N. C.; Duncan, Okla.; Brownsville, Tenn.; McMinnville, Tenn.; San Benito, Tex.; and Lewisburg, W. Va.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I telephoned yesterday and have the figures of the postal receipts for Eaton Rapids; they are \$9,641.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Then the receipts of that town also seem to be growing.

Seventeen more or less prominent towns having postal receipts under \$10,000 here find safe refuge, to wit: Greenville, Ala.; Athens, Ala.; El Dorado, Ark.; Forest City, Ark.; Van Buren, Ark.; Highland, Ill.—

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. CARAWAY. I was wondering how inaccurate the gentleman's information may be. I hold in my hand the record of the postal receipts at Forest City at \$10,994.58 received.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I believe my figures are for the fiscal year ending June 30 last, but possibly it is for 1915.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am curious to know if all the gentleman's information is as inaccurate as that.

Mr. ASHBROOK. There seems to be a difference of \$1,000.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Are not the gentleman's figures for the fiscal year 1915? Do not his figures relate to the fiscal year of 1915?

Mr. ASHBROOK. My understanding is that it is the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916; but I say it may be for 1915.

Mr. MANN. I suspect the gentleman is confusing the fiscal years. The original bill was reported July 7, 1916, and the figures for the fiscal year 1916 were not then available.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I hold in my hand a report of the Auditor of the Post Office Department, and he fixes the receipts of Forest City at \$10,999.58.

Mr. MANN. When this bill was first reported no one knew what the figures were for the fiscal year 1916.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, yes; the first bill was reported July 16, and the fiscal year ended on June 30, 1916.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Did the gentleman have the figures at the time the bill was reported?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; not these figures. But during the hearings we took pains not only to get the report of the fiscal year 1915 but to get the report of the last preceding quarters, and before the bill was reported, in order to determine whether there was such a growth as would guarantee that the fiscal year 1916 would carry them beyond the limit. In these cases where we were satisfied with that, we allowed the item.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am aware of the custom of the committee of applying for the information, and I believe the committee does invariably make the request and consider the information.

Mr. WINGO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. The gentleman says that Van Buren, Ark., has less than \$10,000 postal receipts?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I did.

Mr. WINGO. Where did the gentleman get those figures?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Those figures were furnished me by the Treasury Department. I understood they were for the last fiscal year, but it may be for 1915.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman know anything about the city of Van Buren?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I do not, but if the gentleman comes from there I know it must be a fine city.

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman know anything about the street car system?

Mr. ASHBROOK. No.

Mr. WINGO. Or its smelters?

Mr. ASHBROOK. No; I never smelt 'em. [Laughter.]

Mr. WINGO. Does the gentleman know anything about it or have any idea of it?

Mr. ASHBROOK. No; but I would like to ask the gentleman what is the size of the city?

Mr. WINGO. There is no way to determine the present size by the last census, for the reason that it was incomplete. I could name personally more people living in one city in my district than that census gave as the population of the entire county.

Mr. ASHBROOK. There, then, must have been something wrong in the census returns.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Is it largely on account of the present condition of the Treasury that the gentleman objects to this bill?

Mr. ASHBROOK. The gentleman states my position correctly.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. If that is true, I would like to have the gentleman tell the House why it was that in the closing days of the last session he introduced and was responsible for a widows' pension bill being put through the House that carried with it more than \$16,000,000 of claims that have already been adjudicated, and thousands still unadjudicated, probably carrying some six or eight million dollars more?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I will say to my colleague that I introduced that bill for the same reason that he introduced a bill for the Spanish War widows, and the only difference is that I got my bill through and he did not get his bill through. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I just want to say to the gentleman that I am not complaining, but that my colleague is complaining about the present conditions of the Treasury.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I am very proud to be the author of the widows' pension bill.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. Yes; but the gentleman's statements are not consistent. He is now very solicitous about the condition of the Treasury when this bill is up for consideration, while he was not when his bill was up for consideration.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I understand the gentleman has an item in this bill, and it is for a town where the population decreased in the last decade—Gallion, Ohio.

Mr. KEY of Ohio. I do not think that is true.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I have made the statement, and if the gentleman thinks it is not true let him furnish the facts to convince the House that I have made a misstatement.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman state what are the postal receipts for Gallion, Ohio?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I have all of those figures, but I left them on my desk there, and I guess the gentleman has them now. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will state, if the gentleman will permit me, for his information that the postal receipts at Gallion, Ohio, for the last fiscal year were \$26,587.67, and for the year before that they were \$24,930.60, showing a steady growth.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Can the gentleman tell me the population in 1900 and the population in 1910?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The postal receipts have increased over \$2,000 in a year.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Can the gentleman tell me the population of the town?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I can not, because the committee has not acted upon the population, but according to the business done.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Very well.

Council Grove, Kans.; Norton, Kans.; Winnfield, La.; Charleston, Mo.; Lenor, N. C.; Dunn, N. C.; Sanford, N. C.; Hartsville, S. C.; Lewisburg, Tenn.; Alvin, Tex.; Beckley, W. Va.; 82 towns with postal receipts for the past fiscal year ranging between \$10,000 and \$15,000 can be found in this bill, which, added to the 118 under \$10,000 specifically mentioned, make even 200 of the 309 items in this bill with receipts under \$15,000. Two hundred and fifty-four of the 309 towns and cities provided for in this bill had less than 5,000 population in 1910. Eleven of these towns for which authorization is here made now pay no rental.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman permit me to ask that he put into the RECORD the list of the 118 towns that he says are under \$10,000?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I have already read them into the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to longer take up the time of the committee and have already used much more time than I had expected to use. I believe I have given good and sufficient reasons why at this time it is unwise to pass this bill. Those gentlemen who believe that bonds should be issued, or tax burdens increased on the people, in order that public buildings may be erected at small and insignificant towns will vote for this bill. Those who desire to protect the Federal Treasury from raids of this sort will vote against the bill. I believe the bill should not pass. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL].

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, we have had notice served upon us that the Treasury is facing a deficit approximating

\$300,000,000 for the coming fiscal year, and gentlemen who have and shall have blithely, cheerfully, and in a great many cases enthusiastically voted for approximately all of the appropriations constituting the enormous total which will create that appalling deficit, now suddenly seek to qualify as guardians of the Public Treasury and arrogate to themselves the merit of superior virtue in opposition to a bill that does not carry a penny of appropriation, which will not increase by any appreciable sum the burdens of taxation or the deficit of the coming fiscal year, but which simply proposes to carry out in a very moderate and economic way a long and well-established policy of the Federal Government. I am willing to admit that there is much in the argument that gentlemen make that these public buildings are not absolutely necessary. I am willing to admit that it can be mathematically demonstrated beyond a question that it would be possible for the Government to house in some sort or kind of quarters all of its activities in all of the towns, big and little, provided for in this bill, for a less sum than a reasonable interest upon the investment that we propose, and the cost of upkeep. That same proposition holds true, in my opinion, on almost every building that the Government ever has built for these purposes, or will build, including this magnificent structure in a portion of which we have our sittings, and in which we take such great pride. I have no sort of doubt that with a much less sum than a reasonable or even a small interest charge upon \$24,000,000 that have been invested in this magnificent Capitol, added to the annual cost of upkeep, we could make arrangements with private parties whereby in some sort of a shack the Legislature of this great Government, its Supreme Court, and its other activities might be otherwise provided for. I have no sort of doubt or question but that with a much less sum than a reasonable interest return upon the five millions of investment in that magnificent Library Building across the Plaza and the cost of its upkeep, we could make arrangements with private parties whereby some sort of a structure could be built and maintained for the housing of the library that we have gathered and are gathering. If this rule of three, this proportion of mathematical calculation as to the possible returns of governmental investments and the cost of public activities which is sought to be applied to this proposition of public buildings were applied to all of the activities of the Federal Government, then our appropriations instead of amounting to over a billion and a half a year could well be reduced.

If we did only those things that are absolutely necessary and essential in this country to maintain order and enforce the laws against crime we could reduce our appropriations at least by half, if not more, and we could completely wipe out the great deficit that is facing us. We are at peace with all the world and gentlemen claim that we are tremendously prosperous. Then why, in the name of high heaven, should we halt in carrying out in a proper and decent and very conservative way, as in the case of this bill, a policy upon which the Government embarked many years ago, which has been justified in all of the running of the years by practically everybody except a few gentlemen who apparently seek to make political capital out of an assumption of superior virtue and certain metropolitan journals that are not interested in any kind of governmental expenditures and activities unless they are for alleged public defense or unless the investment is made in or in the vicinity of the great cities of the country. I am one of those who believe that the Government makes no better investment in all the appropriations we make than these investments that house in decent, well-constructed buildings the useful public activities of the people throughout the length and breadth of the land.

Some of these buildings in these so-called small villages, which our friends from the large cities seem to regard so lightly, will represent when erected the only visible sign and evidence of the existence and the presence of the Federal Government in areas almost as large as some of the States of the Union. The flag will float from the summit of buildings which will be erected, if this bill becomes the law, some time in the distant future in my State, where there is not another visible sign or symbol of Federal activity within 100 miles. In my opinion an appropriation to decently house the activities of the Federal Government not only in the great cities of the land but in the smaller towns of the land and in every part of the land, is not only a wise investment of Federal money, but to provide in reason for such building and expenditure is a patriotic duty which we should perform. Gentlemen who are opposing this bill, and yet have items in it, most realize that they are playing a perfectly safe game. They can assume the virtue of opposition to a bill that some assail as a pork-barrel measure and yet be absolutely certain that the item or items in which they

are interested will be provided for. I will go further than those gentlemen. I will vote for this bill, whether it contains the items in my district and State or not, and I will do it because I believe there are few expenditures which we make which are more meritorious than these to decently house the activities of the Federal Government in communities large and small. [Applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Did the gentleman use all of his time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman used all of his time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, the only practicable means of obtaining governmental appropriations to provide adequate postal facilities to meet imperative public needs is in an omnibus bill. There is no probable chance of affording relief through the enactment of an individual bill. Consequently if those denouncing the present bill as "pork" should have their way the result must be extremely prejudicial to public interests in many instances.

The Post Office Department is expected by the public to perform its vast and manifold duties with efficiency and economy. The department manifestly can not do this unless adequate facilities are provided by the Government.

In the city of Syracuse less than 14,000 square feet of floor space are provided for post-office work in the Federal building, while the actual amount required to perform the work satisfactorily is 30,000 square feet. Some additional space outside the Federal building has been provided at a rental of more than \$10,000 per annum.

I have no doubt that in the pending bill there are many instances authorizing appropriations where the public needs are as urgent and imperative as in Syracuse.

It is apparent that so far as the public business is concerned we can not get anywhere by berating ourselves and indulging in acrimonious discussion about "pork." It seems to me that we might better devote our energies in the institution and carrying out of such legislative reforms as will remove for all time to come the cause of the existence of "pork" in bills authorizing appropriations of public funds and in bills appropriating the same. [Applause.]

The public may not generally know, but we well know that the only remedy is in amending the Federal Constitution, thereby conferring upon the President the right to use the pruning knife upon such bills. As long as the President is required to approve or reject a bill as a whole the cry of "pork" will justly continue.

It has been stated by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that the Government will probably face a deficit of some \$300,000,000 for the next fiscal year. In this statement is food for serious thought. It becomes at once apparent that Congress ought to devise and carry to completion some real legislative reforms which will result in material saving to the Government. The power to tax should not be exercised to impose unnecessary additional burdens upon those who have to pay the taxes.

Under the Constitution of the State of New York the governor, in the consideration of any bill presented to him containing several items of appropriation of money, has the right to object to one or more of such items while approving of the other portion of the bill, and the appropriation so objected to shall not take effect unless on reconsideration it shall be approved by two-thirds of the members elected to each house of the legislature of the State. The Federal Constitution ought to be amended along these lines giving to the President at least as much power. [Applause.]

Our forefathers, wise as they were in the framing of the Federal Constitution, could not anticipate everything, and probably least of all "pork." In view of present governmental financial conditions it seems to me that the time is most opportune for aggressive action. And I want to say, as far as I am concerned, that while I temporarily remain a Member of this House, I pledge myself to act with any of my colleagues, regardless of party affiliations, in the institution and carrying out of such legislative reforms as will eliminate "pork" in bills authorizing appropriations and in bills making appropriations of public funds.

It is probably not to be assumed that Congress will of its own initiative reform itself in this respect. And I trust that the time will come when some President, as the leader of a great political party, will advocate, recommend, and persistently urge such an amendment to the Federal Constitution which will result in the saving of millions upon millions of dollars annually to the Government. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman used all of his time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I was impressed a good deal with what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROTH] stated about the merit of each one of the items, but I wish to confine myself largely to the items contained in this bill for the projects in my district. What I may say, however, need not be confined to the particular items which I will mention, but I will say that I believe all the items in the State of Michigan are meritorious, they are economical, and they are needed, and they ought to be provided. Take Detroit, if you please. There is only a million and a quarter dollars provided for that city. This city is making wonderful strides in increase in population and manufactures, and they are absolutely without adequate facilities there for carrying on their postal business.

It is true in the other places they are fair and just, and I think the bill, so far as they are concerned, ought to be allowed.

Mr. Chairman, I want to say something about two items carried in this bill—one for a post-office building and site at Marshall, Mich., at an authorization not to exceed \$75,000; the other for a site for a post-office building at Eaton Rapids, Mich., costing not to exceed \$7,500.

It is sometimes said that the items carried in the public buildings bill are extraordinary and needless. The bill is sometimes characterized by harsh names, and the Members voting therefor held up to derision. I am not saying anything in particular about the other items in the bill. Let the Member who introduced his bill present his own case. I do not feign to give any Member a standing in presenting the merits of his project further than to say that the membership of this House is composed of men of the highest probity, integrity, and honor, for whom I have the highest respect, and I know you would not be here to-day if you were not such. I do not want to shield myself from any just criticism because of including these items for my district contained in the bill or for being a member of the Public Buildings Committee, to which I was assigned, or my action on such committee. That committee is composed of some of the leading Members of the House, who worked zealously and hard to present a good bill. I think I am only doing my duty in presenting these items. I think they are needed and necessary to properly carry on the Government's business in those cities. If you think likewise, then I ask you to favor them; if you do not, then vote against them. I am sure the items are favored in my district, as I have received no protest against them, but many letters in their favor. So I repeat that if those items can not stand on their own merits it would be a mistake to pass them, and they should be excluded.

I live in a district remarkable in many respects. It is naturally level, fertile, and at one time heavily timbered. It comprises five counties, each of them having an old, historic, well-known, and well-established college of high standing, save one, and that one has a State public school. All have magnificent and commodious buildings. Every city, town, and village supports a high or graded school, while the country schools are situated almost within sight of each other throughout the district. Well-improved farms line each side of the highways, most of the farms comprising from 40 to 160 acres. In the city of Kalamazoo is located the largest book paper mills in the Republic. It is the largest city. Battle Creek, with its health-giving sanitarium and food products known the world over, is the second city. Cities of lesser population dot the district from border to border. Michigan is a pioneer of the public-school system, and before the woodman's axe had felled the timber John C. Pierce, living at Marshall, where this building is to be erected, had planned for the State graded school. So that you are not asked to have this building erected in a wild, arid, or sparsely settled region, but in a prosperous, populous district where the people manufacture machinery, do extensive farming, build substantial structures, and patronize the schools and churches.

Without at this time taking up the question of pork, or the great American hog, I want to say something about the necessity of a post-office building at Marshall—Marshall is the county seat of Calhoun County. It is a city of over 5,000. At one time

a bill passed the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan to make it the State capital. It is surrounded by a thickly settled agricultural community. It has no Federal building, but rents a store building in which to conduct the post-office business. This building was not originally constructed for a post office, but for mercantile purposes. It is not fireproof, has no vault, and, although repaired recently for the post office, it is only a make-shift, and a new building adapted to the needs of the post office should be constructed. Mr. Chairman, I wish to quote a letter dated May 22, 1916, written by the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, as to this building:

WASHINGTON, May 22, 1916.

The CHAIRMAN COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS,  
House of Representatives.

Sir: Under date of April 6, 1916, a report was submitted on H. R. 3109, which provides for the erection of a public building at Marshall, Mich.

The Congressman for this district, Hon. J. M. C. SMITH, has presented a letter from the Post Office Department which shows that the postal receipts for the calendar year 1911 were \$43,368.47, and for the last calendar year were \$62,763.35.

Under the classification which was adopted in June, 1915, this would entitle Marshall, Mich., to a stone-faced building.

From the information which Mr. SMITH has furnished it appears that a suitable site centrally and conveniently located can not be purchased for \$6,000, but would cost in the neighborhood of \$10,000.

In view of the foregoing and supplemental to the report of April 6 it is estimated that a one-story building, stone faced, of the size required, would cost \$65,000, and that a suitable site can be acquired for \$10,000 additional.

Respectfully,

B. R. NEWTON, Acting Secretary.

This letter shows the receipts for the calendar year 1915 to be \$62,763.35. I also wish to submit a letter from the Auditor for the Post Office Department, Mr. Kram, showing the cost of operating the post office at Marshall for the years 1911 to 1915, inclusive:

WASHINGTON April 17, 1916.

Hon. J. M. C. SMITH,  
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SMITH: Receipt is acknowledged, by reference from the First Assistant Postmaster General, of your letter of the 8th instant, requesting to be advised as to the cost of operating the post office at Marshall, Mich., during the fiscal years from 1911 to 1915, inclusive. You will find stated below the total in expenditures at the post office in question during each of the fiscal years referred to:

Fiscal year—	
1911	\$20,291.70
1912	21,072.70
1913	21,316.30
1914	21,908.65
1915	22,340.25

Sincerely, yours,

CHAS. A. KRAM,  
Auditor for the Post Office Department.

This letter shows that the operating cost for 1915 was \$22,340.25, leaving the net receipts of the Marshall post office for the year 1915 at \$40,423.10, or more than 10 per cent on \$400,000. Here is a post office that pays out. The bill calls for only \$65,000 for a building and not to exceed \$10,000 for a site. If the people of Marshall pay more than \$40,000 over current expenses to the post office, why are they not entitled to a suitable building, costing not to exceed \$65,000, in which to conduct their business? The people who pay this money into the Post Office Department ought to get this benefit out of the surplus. This bill was regularly heard by the committee, the estimate and type of building suggested and proposed by the Secretary of the Treasury and favorably reported.

I want to state as a sound business proposition that if a person were to permanently engage in business in a city or town requiring a building, I think he would be short-sighted if he did not procure a building of his own if he could afford it. But some will say it is cheaper to rent. The same thing could be said about renting a home, but we all want to own one. If it will pay another to construct a building and rent it to the Government for a post office, it is difficult to see why it would not pay the Government, which estimates its interest at 3 per cent per annum, to build one of its own. I am not talking about an architectural monument, but a substantial building, say, of the type of the Ford Building here on Pennsylvania Avenue and of proportionate cost. The authorizations for post-office buildings are not to exceed a certain amount. That they are not always kept within the authorization is not the fault of a bill or of Congress. The Supervising Architect gives the best building he can for the money and the type, and the cost is usually determined before the bill is passed.

I believe we should have a uniform standard type of structure for buildings to be erected in the same zone, where the temperature and conditions are the same.

Taking for an example all of southern Michigan, the ground is usually level with a gravelly subsoil, of equal temperature,

of like winds and weather. And it would seem that a typical building at a reasonable price could be used in each one of the county seats and smaller cities, which would be uniform, serviceable, and satisfactory.

However, I am no architect. That should be determined by the Supervising Architect's Office. The authorizations made for these buildings are not mandatory. It is not compulsory to use the full appropriation, and the authorization is more of a limitation within which the cost of construction ranges than it is that the full amount should be used.

In the case of the site at Eaton Rapids, Mich., not to exceed \$7,500 is authorized by this bill. The city of Eaton Rapids has a population of about 3,000; has paved streets, electric lights, sewer, large woolen mills, public library, fine school buildings, two banks, artesian wells, two railroads, and a splendid community within and surrounding it. It has free mail delivery, which was granted after the receipts had increased to the \$10,000 mark. It has no Federal building. The building where the post office is situated is grossly inadequate, with a lobby of around 10 feet square.

Now, a splendid location on Main Street could be secured. Eaton Rapids is growing and this opportunity may not always be available.

If it would further acquaint you with Eaton Rapids I might add that this was the home at one time of Austin Blair, the great war governor of Michigan, who first commissioned Gens. Sherman, Custer, and Alger. The Montgomeries, one a former Commissioner of Patents, and the other now judge of the Customs Court in this city, were born there. Senator CUMMINS as a young man resided there. Hon. Ray Woodworth, a Member of the Sixty-third Congress, was born there. And many others who have achieved distinction and success resided or began in Eaton Rapids. For a number of years I myself was in business there and am familiar with the conditions and needs of the city.

To purchase a site on one of the principal corners of the city approximately this amount might be sufficient.

I for one am opposed to placing these Government buildings on side or back streets wherever a suitable location can be procured upon the main or business thoroughfare. By placing the post office on the main street it is more accessible and of greater utility to the business of the city. From its flag pole the Stars and Stripes can be seen by every one going and coming. The building itself would cost no more and its service on Main Street would certainly enhance its value and utility.

We are often told that the construction of these buildings is extravagant. If they are extravagant now, they always have been in the past, and possibly to an extent of limiting the amount therefor according to the population by standardizing the buildings or otherwise curtailing the cost.

Abraham Lincoln, back in 1832 in a speech at Salem, Ill., stated that he was in favor of a protective tariff, a national bank, and internal improvements. If this was wholesome legislation at that time it is to-day. No one need hesitate about following the sainted Lincoln.

Some think this bill ought not to pass on account of the present condition of our national finances. As to that, I beg to say that the spirit of economy has not manifested itself very strongly in the recent administration of our affairs. The World's Almanac, 1917, estimates our national wealth at \$187,739,071,000. We have been appropriating money for many public improvements.

Some think we might get along without \$40,000,000 paid for rivers and harbors improvement. Others think that \$50,000,000 for flood control and a like sum for ship purchase too high. I, myself, am inclined to think that \$11,000,000 for an armor plant at this time, when the largest steel plant in the world agrees to manufacture armor plate for any price named by the Government, might be saved for a time. Possibly \$25,000,000 for the purchase of San Domingo, and a like sum for a bonus to Nicaragua could wait a little; \$9,000,000 taken bodily out of the Treasury for rural credits, \$20,000,000 for the Muscle Shoals might also wait. Marching the Army to Mexico and marching it back again, at a cost of \$100,000,000 or more, being no nearer the border than we were when we started, might have a tinge of extravagance. It shows, however, that we could do it. No one knows what our Mexican policy is. I think we have as much reason and right to go there as we had to go into Cuba or the Philippines, and it is observable now that we possibly made a mistake in the beginning which has been costly to us. We have now conceded to Mexico her own terms. Possibly we will be making a loan to her before long. But in the end I am of the opinion that it will be necessary to go there to restore order, and if we do the Stars and Stripes ought not to be taken down

until she has liquidated for the destruction of life and property of American citizens and other countries for which we may or may not be legally liable.

The passage of this bill will not be heralded throughout the country as a grand achievement. Possibly some not very complimentary statements will be made about those voting for it. But the question should be whether or not these items are necessary for the welfare or proper conduct of the business of our Postal Department, and possibly whether or not we should pursue a tenure of tenantry or ownership. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I regret very much that I can not support this bill at this time. I am not fundamentally opposed to public buildings, but there is a time for everything, and I do not believe the time is here now to undertake to make appropriations or to even make authorizations for the large amount of appropriations to be made later on. Especially do I believe this argument should appeal to my Democratic friends when the Ways and Means Committee day and night is racking its brains for the purpose of finding some way, some manner, somehow, to raise the money to meet the enormous amount of deficit.

One of the latest propositions I have observed floating through the press is to impose a tax of a certain per cent of over and above 8 per cent net income on corporations, copartnerships, and so forth, which is a direct tax. Another proposition is to issue bonds. Another proposition is to issue certificates of indebtedness. For these reasons, staring me in the face, as they do, it strikes me the time is inopportune and inappropriate to undertake to fasten upon the Government of the United States a liability that must be met some time in the near future. It is true these authorizations do not make appropriations, but they constitute a moral obligation on the part of the Government to later on assume and pay them off by means of an appropriation.

Now, the Architect's Office has come in for considerable criticism on the floor of this House. I am not here to defend it at all. It needs no defense. The Architect's Office in the last

year has completed practically a building for every four working days in the year; and during that period of time it turned into the Treasury of the United States nearly \$2,000,000 as money saved, economies effected by the Architect's Office over the appropriations made for the purchase of the site and for the erection and construction of the building.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COX. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think that they ought to have been doing that for many years past?

Mr. COX. They probably ought to have done so.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I have only five minutes of time, and I have not the time to take up all these little items, probably under the five-minute rule, I shall avail myself of time to call the attention of the committee to some of them, but if I do I shall not raise the question where the appropriation is in excess of \$30,000, so far as the appropriation for the building is concerned, and if I refer to section 5 I shall not raise the question where the postal receipts are in excess of \$10,000 a year.

Now, it does strike me that it is bad policy, gentlemen, and I am at a loss to understand upon what ground any man can defend himself in voting to build a post office at every little crossroad country town in the United States—little third-class post offices. Where does the economy come in? Where does the business of the proposition come in?

Here is one item as to Alfredville, Ala. It is a third-class office. Population, 1910, 1,544; receipts, 1915, \$5,663.04; receipts, 1916, \$5,978; present rental, \$500; site authorized, \$5,000; site contracted for, \$2,500; saving, \$2,500; pending bill, \$2,500; department estimate, \$30,000; decrease by bill, \$5,000. Three per cent upon the appropriation of \$25,000 is \$750. You have got to add a janitor. That will come, and you can not keep that away from here at all. That will be from \$50 to \$70 a month, conservatively \$600 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD three tabulations prepared by the Architect's Office, showing the number of buildings completed in 1916 and 1917, and the number of buildings now under contract and not completed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend certain data in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following are the data referred to:

*Buildings under contract and not completed Jan. 1, 1917.*

Buildings.	Limit of cost.		Cost.		Saving.			
	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Site and building.	Total.
ALABAMA.								
Opelika.....	\$7,500	\$105,000	\$4,500	\$99,146	\$3,000	\$5,854		\$8,854
ARIZONA.								
Douglas.....	15,000	100,000	14,000	84,525	1,000	15,475		16,475
ARKANSAS.								
Arkadelphia.....	5,000	55,000	1	49,773	4,999	5,227		10,226
Eureka Springs.....		57,500		57,500				
COLORADO.								
Grand Junction.....	10,000	175,000	9,800	171,237	200	3,743		3,943
CONNECTICUT.								
Greenwich.....	20,000	90,000	19,951	77,173	39	12,827		12,866
Middletown.....	30,000	140,000	28,000	108,707	2,000	31,293		33,293
Naugatuck.....	30,000	80,000	25,000	52,642	5,000	27,358		32,358
Rockville.....	20,000	55,000	19,000	30,541	1,000	4,459		5,459
Seymour.....	15,000	60,000	12,000	53,240	3,000	6,760		9,760
DELAWARE.								
Smymna.....		35,000					\$4,069	4,069
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.								
Washington:								
Interior Department.....		2,596,000					110,000	110,000
Power plant.....		1,669,104					25,786	25,786
FLORIDA.								
Orlando.....	5,000	60,000	5,000	53,655		6,345		6,345
St. Petersburg.....	20,000	102,500	20,000	102,420		80		80
IDAHO.								
Boise.....		125,000				7,282		7,282
ILLINOIS.								
Taylorville.....	15,000	60,000	12,000	50,434	3,000	9,566		12,566

Buildings under contract and not completed Jan. 1, 1917—Continued.

Buildings.	Limit of cost.		Cost.		Saving.			
	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Site and building.	Total.
INDIANA.								
Huntington.....	\$20,000	\$95,000	\$20,000	\$78,529		\$16,471		\$16,471
Newcastle.....		90,000					\$17,062	17,062
Seymour.....		75,000					6,766	6,766
Washington.....	10,000	60,000	5,340	54,213	\$4,660	5,787		10,447
IOWA.								
Charles City.....	10,000	70,000	8,500	50,449	1,500	19,551		21,051
Grinnell.....	15,000	90,000	15,000	66,405		23,595		23,595
Washington.....	10,000	80,000	10,000	52,136		27,864		27,864
KENTUCKY.								
Ashland.....	20,000	100,000	20,000	64,633		35,367		35,367
LOUISIANA.								
Minden.....		50,000					580	580
MAINE.								
Cardiner.....		105,000					19,292	19,292
Rumford.....	10,000	60,000	10,000	58,689		1,311		1,311
Skowhegan.....	20,000	65,000	13,335	61,799	6,665	3,201		9,866
MARYLAND.								
Baltimore immigrant station.....		550,000					83,708	83,708
MASSACHUSETTS.								
Attleboro.....	20,000	100,000	20,000	92,068		7,932		7,932
Boston appropriation.....		1,250,000					68,802	68,802
North Attleboro.....		70,000					1,718	1,718
MICHIGAN.								
Albion.....		70,000					3,073	3,073
Ypsilanti.....		75,000					15,971	15,971
MINNESOTA.								
Anoka.....	5,000	50,000	4,000	47,662	1,000	2,338		3,338
Little Falls.....	5,000	65,000	5,000	57,471		7,529		7,529
MISSOURI.								
Fulton.....		60,000					2,496	2,496
MONTANA.								
Kalispell.....	15,000	100,000	15,000	87,924		12,076		12,076
NEBRASKA.								
Alliance.....	15,000	75,000	15,000	62,887		12,113		12,113
Aurora.....	6,000	50,000	6,000	48,742		1,258		1,258
Falls City.....	6,000	65,000	5,700	47,202	300	17,798		18,098
NEW JERSEY.								
Hackensack.....	25,000	100,000	25,000	78,955		21,045		21,045
NEW YORK.								
Batavia.....	15,000	85,000	15,000	68,160		16,840		16,840
Gouverneur.....		70,000					5,735	5,735
Hornell.....	20,000	85,000	11,000	69,847	9,000	15,153		24,153
Salamanca.....		85,000					13,698	13,698
NORTH CAROLINA.								
Charlotte.....		250,000					43,286	43,286
Shelby.....	10,000	55,000	8,000	52,812	2,000	2,188		4,188
Waynesville.....	7,500	65,000	8,945	57,726	1,555	7,274		8,829
Wilkesboro.....		60,000					1,244	1,244
Wilmington, customhouse.....		600,000					90,693	90,693
NORTH DAKOTA.								
Dickinson.....	10,000	90,000	9,500	78,033	500	11,967		12,467
Valley City.....	10,000	75,000	4,800	74,902	5,200	98		5,298
OHIO.								
Alliance.....		135,000					2,771	2,771
Ashland.....	25,000	100,000	23,000	97,537	2,000	2,463		4,463
Elyria.....	25,000	100,000	25,000	87,948		12,052		12,052
Logan.....	15,000	60,000	12,500	47,519	2,500	12,481		14,981
Middletown.....	10,000	100,000	10,000	82,144		17,856		17,856
Newark.....		190,000					37,266	37,266
Sidney.....	20,000	70,000	20,000	58,350		11,650		11,650
Van Wert.....	10,000	70,000	10,000	63,222		6,778		6,778
OKLAHOMA.								
Tulsa.....	20,000	310,000	14,800	228,523	5,200	81,477		86,677
OREGON.								
Portland.....	340,000	1,000,000	340,000	983,166		16,834		16,834
Roseburg.....	10,000	100,000	10,000	91,750		8,250		8,250
PENNSYLVANIA.								
East Pittsburgh.....		100,000					2,302	2,302
Monongahela.....		80,000					2,473	2,473
Pottstown.....	25,000	90,000	17,000	75,824	8,000	14,176		22,176
Ridgway.....	10,000	80,000	10,000	77,728		2,272		2,272
South Bethlehem.....	20,000	100,000	18,000	78,055	2,000	21,945		23,945
Titusville.....	25,000	75,000	25,000	59,355		15,645		15,645

Buildings under contract and not completed Jan. 1, 1917—Continued.

Buildings.	Limit of cost.		Cost.		Saving.			
	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Site and building.	Total.
RHODE ISLAND.								
Newport.....		\$400,000					\$51,769	\$51,769
SOUTH DAKOTA.								
Redfield.....	\$10,000	65,000	\$5,600	\$63,798	\$3,400	\$1,202		4,602
TENNESSEE.								
Humboldt.....	5,000	50,000	4,000	46,947	1,000	3,053		4,053
Maryville.....	10,000	60,000	10,000	58,851		1,149		1,149
Nashville.....		400,000				12,454		12,454
TEXAS.								
Belton.....	5,000	55,000	4,000	53,100	1,000	1,900		2,900
Brenham.....	10,000	60,000	9,850	49,336	150	10,664		10,814
Corpus Christi.....		140,000					747	747
Cuero.....	7,500	45,000	3,750	38,329	3,750	6,671		10,421
Navasota.....	5,000	50,000	4,500	46,714	500	3,286		3,786
New Braunfels.....	7,500	50,000	6,300	45,199	1,200	4,801		6,001
Yoakum.....	5,000	65,000	1	49,060	4,999	15,940		20,939
VIRGINIA.								
Franklin.....	5,000	45,000	5,000	41,684		3,316		3,316
Norton.....		75,000					6,867	6,867
South Boston.....	5,000	50,000	4,800	47,389	200	2,611		2,811
Warrenton.....	12,000	50,000	12,000	48,207		1,793		1,793
WASHINGTON.								
Aberdeen.....	12,500	112,500	12,500	81,441		31,059		31,059
Ellensburg.....	7,000	75,000	7,000	59,941		15,059		15,059
Vancouver.....	12,500	140,000	12,500	89,363		50,637		50,637
WEST VIRGINIA.								
Buckhannon.....	10,000	60,000	10,000	42,562		17,438		17,438
Elkins.....	10,000	135,000	10,000	124,646		10,354		10,354
Huntington.....		225,000				50,282		50,282
WISCONSIN.								
Antigo.....	10,000	70,000	8,250	65,366	1,750	4,634		6,384
Fort Atkinson.....		60,000					5,874	5,874
Merrill.....	7,500	75,000	4,463	59,482	3,037	15,518		18,555
Neenah.....	7,500	80,000	5,000	64,585	2,500	15,415		17,915
Total.....					98,804	908,140	624,048	1,630,992

Under construction, 99.

Buildings completed between Jan. 1, 1916, and Jan. 1, 1917.

Buildings.	Limit of cost.		Cost.		Saving.			Total.
	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Site and building.	
Mobile, Ala.....	\$125,000	\$300,000	\$125,000	\$292,987		\$7,013		\$7,013
Chico, Cal.....		100,000					\$1,216	1,216
Hanford, Cal.....		75,000						
La Junta, Colo.....		85,000					6,187	6,187
Danbury, Conn.....		115,000					6,112	6,112
Stamford, Conn.....		150,000					17,839	17,839
Live Oak, Fla.....	7,500	60,000	7,000	51,144	\$500	8,856		9,356
Palatka, Fla.....		60,000					4,727	4,727
Augusta, Ga.....	35,000	325,000	35,000	322,964		2,036		2,036
Quitman, Ga.....		50,000					938	938
Idaho Falls, Idaho.....		100,000					909	909
Pocatello, Idaho.....	10,000	100,000	1	96,670	9,999	3,330		13,329
Beardstown, Ill.....		55,000					2,840	2,840
Canton, Ill.....		85,000					5,497	5,497
Collinsville, Ill.....		70,000					1,475	1,475
La Salle, Ill.....		100,000					15,847	15,847
Mount Vernon, Ill.....		90,000					8,123	8,123
Princeton, Ill.....		70,000					989	989
Robinson, Ill.....		70,000					4,938	4,938
Gary, Ind.....		125,000					20,497	20,497
New Albany, Ind.....		75,000					601	601
Portland, Ind.....		60,000					3,279	3,279
Chanute, Kans.....		75,000					5,760	5,760
Garden City, Kans.....		66,050					2,236	2,236
Winfield, Kans.....		75,000					2,677	2,677
Georgetown, Ky.....		90,000					8,992	8,992
Jackson, Ky.....		100,000					575	575
Middlesboro, Ky.....		85,000					6,213	6,213
Greenfield, Mass.....		100,000					17,000	17,000
Ishpeming, Mich.....		75,000					2,817	2,817
Lake City, Minn.....		55,000					3,258	3,258
Canton, Miss.....		50,000					1,731	1,731
Clarksdale, Miss.....		115,750					1,176	1,176
Laurel, Miss.....	12,500	80,000	8,000	72,298	4,500	7,702		12,202
Moberly, Mo.....		35,000					9	9
Webb City, Mo.....		70,000					5,927	5,927
Bozeman, Mont.....		75,000						
Miles City, Mont.....		150,000					39,787	39,787
McCook, Nebr.....	8,000	120,000	5,750	114,568	2,250	5,432		7,682
Morristown, N. J.....	35,000	125,000	35,000	114,210		10,790		10,790
Orange, N. J.....	30,000	100,000	30,000	95,423		4,577		4,577
Glens Falls, N. Y.....		100,000					7,010	7,010
Port Jervis, N. Y.....		80,000					12,200	12,200
Gastonia, N. C.....		85,000					3,729	3,729
Kinston, N. C.....		90,000					13,660	13,660

## Buildings completed between Jan. 1, 1916, and Jan. 1, 1917—Continued.

Buildings.	Limit of cost.		Cost.		Saving.			Total.
	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Site and building.	
Rocky Mount, N. C.		\$86,000					\$6,686	\$6,686
Wahpeton, N. Dak.		50,000					1,582	1,582
Tiffin, Ohio		97,500					444	444
Ardmore, Okla.		150,000					4,409	4,409
Blackwell, Okla.		50,000					1,576	1,576
El Reno, Okla.		100,000					19,621	19,621
Medford, Oreg.		110,000	\$1	\$109,374			626	626
Pendleton, Oreg.		180,000					13,217	13,217
The Dalles, Oreg.		104,000					5,266	5,266
Carnegie, Pa.		80,000					1,086	1,086
Narragansett Pier, R. I.		69,000					959	959
Cookeville, Tenn.		100,000					7,646	7,646
Covington, Tenn.		45,000						
Jellico, Tenn.	\$10,000	70,000	10,000	68,234		\$3,766		3,766
Shelbyville, Tenn.	5,000	60,000	4,600	57,118	\$100	2,882		2,882
Amarillo, Tex.		200,000					11,018	11,018
Bryan, Tex.		50,000					1,146	1,146
Ennis, Tex.		60,000					728	728
Longview, Tex.		50,000					2,739	2,739
Marlin, Tex.	7,500	57,000	7,450	47,900	50	9,100		9,150
Uvalde, Tex.		60,000					3,238	3,238
Hampton, Va.		80,000					1,035	1,035
Wellsburg, W. Va.		40,000					1,773	1,773
Milwaukee, Wis., appraisers' stores	50,000	115,000	45,500	104,295	1,500	10,705		12,205
Casper, Wyo.	15,000	55,000	15,000	49,984	1,000	5,016		6,016
Douglas, Wyo.	10,000	65,000	8,000	62,915	2,000	2,085		4,085
Total					22,199	83,290	321,596	427,085

Total buildings, 71.

## Buildings completed between Jan. 1, 1915, and Jan. 1, 1916.

Buildings.	Limit of cost.		Cost.		Saving.			Total.
	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Site and building.	
Newport, Ark.		\$59,500					\$4,771	\$4,771
Searcy, Ark.	\$6,000	45,000	\$1,500	\$43,645	\$4,500	\$1,355		5,855
Berkeley, Cal.		180,000					14,899	14,899
Grass Valley, Cal.	10,000	55,000	10,000	53,684		1,316		1,316
Pasadena, Cal.	50,000	290,000	50,000	193,115		6,885		6,885
San Francisco, Cal., Subtreasury	375,000	500,000	375,000	469,594		30,406		30,406
Denver, Colo.	500,000	2,000,000	488,801	1,974,907	13,199	25,093		38,292
Greeley, Colo.	15,000	118,000	15,000	102,937		7,063		7,063
Lewes, Del.	5,000	40,000	4,900	30,730	10	9,270		9,280
Pensacola, Fla.		130,000						
Bainbridge, Ga.	7,500	50,000	7,500	48,713		1,287		1,287
Cartersville, Ga.	7,500	51,250	7,500	47,565		3,685		3,685
Cedartown, Ga.	7,500	80,000	6,500	47,526	1,000	2,474		3,474
Thomasville, Ga.		70,000					2,617	2,617
Blue Island, Ill.		70,000					2,349	2,349
Duquoin, Ill.		65,000					1,859	1,859
Edwardsville, Ill.		70,000					1,388	1,388
Evanston, Ill.		50,000						
Macomb, Ill.		70,000					2,263	2,263
Sycamore, Ill.		60,000					987	987
Urbana, Ill.		80,000					658	2,638
Frankfort, Ind.	15,000	70,000	10,500	67,210	4,500	2,790		7,290
Mishawaka, Ind.		75,000					3,566	3,566
Le Mars, Iowa.	10,000	50,000	3,000	48,338	7,000	1,062		8,062
Perry, Iowa.		60,000					1,358	1,358
Arkansas City, Kans.		75,000					1,065	1,065
Concordia, Kans.	7,500	70,000	7,500	64,155		5,845		5,845
McPherson, Kans.		80,000					1,126	1,126
Osage City, Kans.		57,000					206	206
Ottawa, Kans.	7,500	65,000	7,450	61,586	10	3,414		3,424
Salina, Kans.		70,000						
Topeka, Kans.		100,000						
Bardstow, Ky.	10,000	60,000	10,000	58,486		1,514		1,514
Fulton, Ky.		50,000					60	60
Hopkinsville, Ky.	12,000	85,000	12,000	75,473		9,527		9,527
Crowley, La.		55,000						
Jennings, La.		50,000					574	574
Lafayette, La.		65,000					2,758	2,758
New Orleans, La.		1,657,000						
Bangor, Me.		440,000					2,423	2,423
Camden, Me.	10,000	75,000	9,500	74,862	500	138		638
Boston, Mass., customhouse		2,070,324					10,287	10,287
New Bedford, Mass.	125,000	350,000	108,000	328,777	17,000	21,223		38,223
Plymouth, Mass.		117,000					3,438	3,438
Big Rapids, Mich.		70,000					6,719	6,719
Cadillac, Mich.		105,000					14,818	14,818
Holland, Mich.		100,000					14,513	14,513
Petosky, Mich.	10,000	65,000	10,000	60,744		4,256		4,256
Three Rivers, Mich.		60,000					879	879
Minneapolis, Minn.	350,000	900,000	349,500	892,087	100	7,913		8,013
Moorhead, Minn.	5,000	63,500	4,900	63,500	100			100
Owatonna, Minn.		58,000					1,961	1,961
Grenada, Miss.		50,000					969	969
Tupelo, Miss.		60,000					803	803
Vicksburg, Miss.	15,000	110,000	11,000	109,014	4,000	986		4,986
Boonville, Mo.	10,000	50,000						
Brookfield, Mo.	10,000	65,000	9,100	65,000	900			900
De Soto, Mo.		40,000					1,475	1,475
Excelsior Springs, Mo.		40,000					86	86
Rolla, Mo.	5,000	50,000	4,340	47,475	660	2,525		3,185
Springfield, Mo.		100,000						
Rochester, N. H.	15,000	75,000	15,000	70,848		4,152		4,152
Burlington, N. J.		55,000					383	383

Buildings completed between Jan. 1, 1915, and Jan. 1, 1916—Continued.

Buildings.	Limit of cost.		Cost.		Saving.		
	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Site.	Building.	Total.
Long Branch, N. J.		\$125,000				\$6,413	\$6,413
Auburn, N. Y.		50,000					
Cortland, N. Y.	\$20,000	80,000	\$20,000	\$77,784		\$2,216	2,216
Fulton, N. Y.	10,000	75,000	10,000	75,000			
New Rochelle, N. Y.		125,000				10,611	10,611
New York, N. Y., marine hospital		250,000				1,141	1,141
Oneonta, N. Y.	20,000	75,000	19,516	75,000	\$484		484
Charlotte, N. C., assay office		25,000					
Greenville, N. C.	10,000	55,000	9,500	61,650	500	3,350	3,850
Hendersonville, N. C.		70,000				1,657	1,657
Monroe, N. C.	10,000	53,000	10,000	52,937		63	63
Raleigh, N. C.		225,000				1,748	1,748
Tarboro, N. C.		75,000				5,197	5,197
Mandan, N. Dak.		66,000				2,019	2,019
Minot, N. Dak.		150,000				3,436	3,436
Williston, N. Dak.		100,000				238	238
Bellaire, Ohio		95,000				662	662
Cambridge, Ohio		85,000				727	727
Canton, Ohio		20,000				296	296
Dayton, Ohio	310,000	550,000	310,000	549,927		73	73
Piqua, Ohio		175,000				4,003	4,003
Salem, Ohio		85,000				1,590	1,590
Chickasha, Okla.	15,000	135,000	13,500	135,000	1,500		1,500
Guthrie, Okla.		125,000				3,904	3,904
Muskogee, Okla.		560,000				30	30
Albany, Oreg.		75,000				4,389	4,389
Bedford, Pa.		80,000				9,272	9,272
Corry, Pa.	18,000	100,000	14,100	99,930	3,900	70	3,970
Huntingdon, Pa.		80,000				18	18
Bennettsville, S. C.		50,000					
Camden, S. C.		50,000				419	419
Brookings, S. Dak.	7,500	75,000	7,250	75,000	250		250
Fayetteville, Tenn.		50,000				1,444	1,444
Lebanon, Tenn.	5,000	50,000	4,000	48,665	1,000	1,335	2,335
Morristown, Tenn.	5,000	70,000	5,000	63,526		6,474	6,474
Pulaski, Tenn.	7,500	50,000	4,500	48,782	3,000	1,218	4,218
Springfield, Tenn.	5,000	45,000	5,000	44,979		21	21
Winchester, Tenn.		57,000				1,644	1,644
Clarksville, Tex.	5,000	45,000	5,000	44,696		304	304
Hillsboro, Tex.		70,000					
Brigham, Utah		55,000				427	427
Bedford City, Va.	7,500	45,000	7,500	44,915		84	84
Covington, Va.	7,500	45,000	4,500	45,000	3,000		3,000
Wytheville, Va.	5,000	60,000	5,000	59,000		1,000	1,000
Moundsville, W. Va.		90,000				14,115	14,115
Delevan, Wis.		62,500				4,927	4,927
Menomonie, Wis.	10,000	50,000	10,000	47,554		2,446	2,446
Sparta, Wis.		60,000				1,454	1,454
Total					67,113	173,433	185,039
							425,585

Total buildings, 111.

[Mr. REILLY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield two and one-half minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. Now, Mr. Chairman, may I have the two minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for two minutes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I know that one subjects himself to criticism as being inconsistent when there is an item in the bill coming from his district, placed there by a suggestion of the Member, and then he refuses to support the bill. The item in this bill from my district was first introduced in 1910. A site was purchased. The receipts of the post office of that town are \$26,000 a year. There are 18 mails every day. There are 9 rural routes. The town is on 3 trunk lines. It has 3 banks, with a capital of \$1,308,000. It ought to have a building. I introduced a measure. It is put in an omnibus bill that has in it, according to my colleague from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], 200 items that are not within the Postmaster General's rules.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Did not the gentleman introduce four bills?

Mr. FESS. The gentleman introduced the same bills that had been introduced before. And that again shows, Mr. Chairman, the viciousness of this legislation. A man says that you ought not to introduce a bill unless you stand for it. I have

18 towns in my district that ought to have public buildings if this bill becomes the policy of the Government, and everybody knows that that is perfectly impracticable. The suggestion of my friend is just as far afield as the viciousness of this sort of legislation is apparent.

Mr. Chairman, I shall vote against this measure, because omnibus legislation is vicious and ought to be omitted from this Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the city of Urbana, Ohio, is located in a very rich agricultural section of the country. As I have just stated, it has three trunk lines passing through it—one interurban line. It has a population of about 9,000, and its postal receipts are nearly \$26,000 per year. It is a growing city which at the time of the last census of 1910 had a population equal to 57 per cent of the towns already provided with Federal buildings prior to 1916.

In 1910 a site was authorized and later purchased for \$13,000. Bills were introduced in the Sixty-second and Sixty-third Congresses. I reintroduced a bill in the Sixty-fourth Congress which was made a part of the present omnibus bill.

This item is worthy. It falls within the requirements of the recommendations of the Postmaster General. My people want it, and expect me to urge it; which I would like to do. But, Mr. Chairman, I have examined the measure before us. Note what I am asked to indorse in order to have the people of Urbana provided with what they merit. Take the State of the chairman of the committee. There are seven Florida towns included in this bill. Urbana has a population equal to the total of the two highest of the Florida towns, and seven times that of the lowest. Its population is six times that of one town, four times that of any one of three others, and greater than the sum of five out of the seven. If I compare my own district with the provisions of this bill for Florida, I have one town which is one and one-half times the size of the greatest of the seven Florida towns, and 19 towns greater than the smallest of the Florida towns. I have 14 greater

than any one of the two smallest in Florida. None of the towns referred to in my district are provided for.

The same is true when compared with Georgia, which has 19 items in this bill. Its greatest town is not half as large as Urbana. This town has seven times the population of two of the Georgia towns, four times the population of seven of the Georgia towns, three times the population of 11 of the Georgia towns, and twice the population of 19 of the Georgia towns.

Take my district in comparison with Georgia in the bill. It has 3 towns with population equal to that of the highest of 19 in Georgia, 4 equal to that of any 1 of 13, 7 equal to that of any 1 of 3, 18 greater than either 1 of 2, and 24 greater than that of the lowest.

The same is true when compared with North Carolina, which has 16 items. Urbana has a greater population than that of the highest of the 16 and greater than the next 2 highest put together. Her population is three times that of any 1 of 12 of the 16 in North Carolina and four times that of any 1 of 6, and five times that of any 1 of 4 and seven times that of the lowest of the 16. My district has 2 other towns, each with a population greater than that of any 1 of 14 of the 16 in North Carolina provided for in this bill. It has 16 towns with a population greater than the lowest of the 16 North Carolina towns.

The same comparison could be made with Kentucky and Missouri, as well as other States, with similar results.

If the comparison is made by receipts of the office, the same conclusions are reached. In 130 items picked out in this bill about 30 would meet the recommendation of the Postmaster General. I note that at least 1 item falls under \$5,000 annual receipts, 8 under \$6,000, 27 under \$7,000, 46 under \$8,000, 56 under \$9,000, 65 under \$10,000, 100 under \$15,000.

When these items are compared in receipts with those of Urbana, we find that Urbana has five times those of 1 item in the bill, four times those of any 1 of eight items in the bill, three times those of any 1 of 46, twice those of any 1 of 65 items in the bill, and one and one-half times those of any 1 of 100 items in the bill.

If we take it by district, the same conclusions must be drawn. That is, if the principle of this bill is to be the policy of the Government; then, instead of recognizing 1 town in the seventh Ohio district for Federal attention in the public-buildings act we should have at least 18 towns in this bill. Aside from the county seats, we have the following:

Post office.	Population.	Gross receipts.	Rent, light, and fuel.	Other expenditures—compensation, clerk hire, etc.	Class.	Salary.
Belle Center.....	889	\$3,577.23	\$440.00	\$1,813.08	3	\$1,500
Blanchester.....	1,813	15,788.01	500.00	5,444.18	2	2,400
Cedarville.....	1,059	3,691.89	300.00	1,818.56	3	1,500
De Graff.....	1,082	3,862.51	294.00	1,817.04	3	1,500
Franklin.....	2,659	9,654.12	783.33	5,043.09	2	2,100
Jamestown.....	1,133	4,796.90	360.00	2,027.20	3	1,600
Jeffersonville.....	716	2,822.67	144.36	2,005.64	3	1,300
Mechanicsburg.....	1,446	8,348.10	350.00	2,378.49	2	2,000
Milford Center.....	685	2,573.94	96.00	1,218.98	3	1,100
Morrow.....	832	3,041.67	160.00	1,543.92	3	1,400
Mount Sterling.....	1,071	5,827.71	328.00	2,127.22	3	1,700
New Carlisle.....	1,058	4,634.25	368.00	2,013.92	3	1,600
New Vienna.....	793	3,070.55	252.00	1,608.64	3	1,400
Osborn.....	866	3,070.58	194.02	1,711.28	3	1,400
Plain City.....	1,407	4,769.70	265.00	1,918.04	3	1,600
Richwood.....	1,729	7,135.80	240.00	3,179.84	3	1,900
Sabina.....	1,514	5,240.56	250.00	2,270.08	3	1,600
South Charleston.....	1,181	3,907.81	500.00	1,723.84	3	1,500
St. Paris.....	1,261	5,120.62	325.00	2,099.88	3	1,700
Waynesville.....	705	2,920.14	380.00	1,503.54	3	1,300
West Jefferson.....	1,043	2,195.35	143.96	1,243.36	3	1,100
West Liberty.....	1,288	4,630.97	400.00	2,010.66	3	1,600
West Mansfield.....	913	3,212.76	272.00	1,589.20	3	1,400
Yellow Springs.....	1,360	4,305.34	380.00	1,834.24	3	1,600

The figures for the county seats are as follows:

Post office.	Population 1910.	Gross receipts.	Rent, light, and fuel.	Other expenditures.
Bellefontaine <sup>1</sup> .....	9,237	\$23,364.88		
Lebanon.....	2,698	17,613.14	\$1,080.00	\$10,334.19
London.....	3,530	14,931.21	900.00	10,533.92
Marysville.....	3,576	14,813.79	800.00	12,092.14
Springfield <sup>1</sup> .....	51,550	481,026.79		
Urbana.....	7,739	25,676.54	1,600.00	16,542.60
Washington Courthouse.....	7,277	27,844.32	1,163.85	16,742.89
Wilmington.....	4,491	18,343.98	1,050.00	11,199.29
Xenia <sup>1</sup> .....	8,712	28,147.60		

<sup>1</sup> Have public buildings.

The status of county seats in my district, to say nothing about the before-mentioned villages herein contained, is stated by the Treasury Department as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, May 27, 1916.

Hon. S. D. FESS,  
House of Representatives, United States.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The following information in regard to public buildings in your district is furnished in response to your request of the 20th instant:

Lebanon, Ohio: There is no Federal building at this place and no bill pending at the present time for the construction of one. A bill, H. R. 15353, was introduced in the Sixty-second Congress by Mr. Denver, and reported on by this department January 27, 1912, but no legislation resulted.

Wilmington, Ohio: The act of March 4, 1913, authorized the acquisition of a site and construction of a building at this place, at a limit of cost of \$75,000. While land offered for this site has been examined and reported upon, no selection of the site has yet been made.

Xenia, Ohio: A site was authorized at this place on May 30, 1908, and the construction of a building on June 25, 1910. In accordance with this legislation a building was constructed and occupied in 1914.

Springfield, Ohio: A site and building at this place were authorized March 3, 1885, and additional land and extension to the building authorized June 30, 1906. The extension was completed and occupied in 1909.

London, Ohio: There is no Federal building at this place, and no bill has been introduced providing for one.

Washington Court House, Ohio: The act of March 4, 1913, authorized a site and building at this place at a limit of cost of \$80,000. A site has been acquired for \$15,000, and it is probable that the building will be placed under construction during the coming calendar year.

Urbana, Ohio: The act of June 25, 1910, authorized the acquisition of a site at this place at a limit of cost of \$15,000. A site was acquired for \$13,000. No bill is now pending for the construction of a building, but bills H. R. 13914 and 12239 were introduced in the Sixty-second and Sixty-third Congresses, respectively.

Bellefontaine, Ohio: The act of May 30, 1908, authorized a site at this place, and act of June 25, 1910, the construction of a building. In accordance with this legislation a building has been constructed, and was occupied in 1914.

Marysville, Ohio: There is no Federal building at this place, and no bill has been introduced providing for one.

Very truly, yours,

B. R. NEWTON,  
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, it is but natural for a community to desire a public building erected and maintained at Federal expense. It is an adornment for any town of which the people would be proud. But such an institution entails expense, to be met by public taxation. The upkeep of such a building would be costly, whether the mail was great or small. The Congressman, naturally desirous of pleasing his people, must not forget that the burdens of the Government are what he makes them. To-day, when the Government is using a fine-toothed comb to find revenue to meet the expenses of the Government, it is a poor time to waste the public funds as here proposed.

Already the Government is so far behind the authorizations that our people have become impatient over the delay. In the early part of 1913 an act was passed authorizing the purchase of a site at Washington Court House, a building at a limit of cost of \$80,000. The site was purchased, but the building has not yet been advertised. My request for information from the office brought the following instruction:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, February 26, 1916.

Hon. SIMON D. FESS,  
House of Representatives of the United States.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Referring to the telephone message from your secretary on February 24 relative to the Federal building to be erected at Washington Court House, Ohio, no definite statement can be made at this time as to when the work will be advertised. In accordance with the present program, bids for the construction of this building should be invited during the third quarter of the calendar year 1917.

Very truly, yours,

B. R. NEWTON,  
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to see a building erected in Urbana, a modern city of over 8,000 people, with 7 schools, including a college, 18 daily mails, 9 rural routes, 12 churches, 20 fraternal societies, the domicile of Company D of the Ohio National Guard, and 3 banks, with \$1,308,000 deposits, a city which meets the requirements of the recommendations of the Postmaster General, and equal to any one of the 922, or 62 per cent of the 1,479 post-office buildings already erected by the Government. But when I am compelled to vote for a bill which contains over 200 items excluded, not only by the recommendations of the department, but by the sheerest common sense, it is too high a price to pay. While the people of Urbana will be disappointed, their common sense will justify my course.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. SAUNDERS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, sundry messages, in writing, from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, were received.

## PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KENT].

[Mr. KENT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I desire to say that I agree with what the gentleman from Montana says, that it is folly and useless to attempt to rent all public buildings. That is nonsensical.

Now, this bill should be treated just the same as any other bill that comes into this House. Every bill, I take it, has some good points in it, and every bill has, I presume, some bad points in it. Now, it should be read as other bills are read. The good features of the bill should be retained and the bad features of the bill should be stricken out.

Now, that is my position with respect to this bill. I feel that it is unjust and improper to attack the bill in its entirety because a few places are undeserving of having public buildings. The bill should be treated in the same manner that we treat other legislation. I have a provision in this bill for \$70,000 for a site and building in the city of Painesville, in my district. There is no public building in my district now. The city of Painesville has a population of something like 5,000 people, with post-office receipts of \$43,354.37, over four times the amount required by the rule laid down in this bill.

Now, I want to say to these gentlemen that the committee has not bound me in this matter. If these gentlemen who have provisions in this bill for post-office buildings for their districts and who are opposing this bill are not kind enough to move to strike those provisions out if they should not be in the bill, I want to notify them that I shall be in the House when the bill is read, and I shall move to strike them out; and they will either go on record to vote against the provisions for their districts or they will go on record as being in favor of them. [Applause.]

Mr. REILLY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Certainly.

Mr. REILLY. Then, the gentleman believes a post office should be a bribe for a Congressman to vote?

Mr. EMERSON. I do not believe anything of the kind. I feel that there should be post offices in the places where they should be, where the places are large enough, and where the receipts warrant it, and where it would be for the benefit of the public to have such buildings. I regret that there is no way of getting a public building in a place that deserves it except by a bill of this character.

Mr. KENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. KENT. Supposing a man has an item in this bill for a place that does deserve a post office, and suppose he conscientiously objects to the form it takes and the district-by-district manner in which it is distributed?

Mr. EMERSON. That is not the position I take. I would give a man a chance to defend it. I do not say that I would vote against it, but I would give him a chance to vote against that particular item in the bill, or show why it should remain in the bill.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes.

Mr. PLATT. Did not the gentleman say he thought this bill should be considered like any other bill, and that items that are not deserving should be stricken out?

Mr. EMERSON. Yes; I did.

Mr. PLATT. And yet you are going to ask them to strike them out?

Mr. EMERSON. No. I will ask them to defend it as I do mine. The city of Painesville, Ohio, by all that is just and right deserves a public building. We could easily withdraw the National Guard from the Mexican border, where it is not needed, and save enough money to take care of this appropriation.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield back his time?

Mr. EMERSON. I thought I had used up my time.

The CHAIRMAN. No. The gentleman has used four minutes.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I submit the following as a part of my remarks:

The following facts and figures abundantly prove Painesville's right to the \$70,000 proposed appropriation for a new Federal building, and

also speak most elegantly on the growth of our city. In the face of this evidence further comment is unnecessary:

The postal receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916, were \$43,354.37.

The postal receipts for the quarter ending March 31, 1916, were \$16,087.37, the largest amount received in any one quarter in the whole history of the office.

The month of May this year shows postal receipts of \$3,948.90, a gain of about 40 per cent over a year ago, and a little better gain over two years ago.

The quarter ending June 30 this year shows a gain of \$1,437.91 over the corresponding time last year.

The postal receipts of Port Clinton and Eaton are, respectively, somewhere between \$11,000 and \$13,000, while the receipts of Painesville office for the one quarter ending March 31, 1916, were \$16,087.37.

Bowling Green, Ohio, has an elegant Federal building, with postal receipts of less than one-half of the revenue of Painesville.

The gain in revenue, one year over the preceding one, at the Painesville post office represents a greater amount of money than the entire annual revenue of many places in the United States where Federal buildings have been provided.

Nothing indicates the growth of a place more certainly than an increase in sale of 2-cent stamps at the post office of any place. There were sold at the Painesville post office this year in May 76,300 2-cent stamps, in June 59,400, which sales break all previous records for May and June.

In money-order business the Painesville office outranks many places four times the size of this city. There were 50,378 transactions in the money-order department of the local office for the year ending June 30, 1916.

The deposits in the postal savings bank are, per capita, four times the average of the whole country.

The revenue of the local office for the year ending June 30, 1916, met approximately all the local expenses, and there was a balance of \$15,756.99 turned in to the Post Office Department.

## POSTAL RECEIPTS PER ANNUM OF THE PAINESVILLE OFFICE FOR 10 YEARS.

In each case the revenue is computed for the fiscal year, which is from July 1 to June 30, inclusive:

1906-7	\$27,465.25
1907-8	28,148.93
1908-9	29,912.84
1909-10	31,589.99
1910-11	33,049.20
1911-12	33,730.11
1912-13	36,946.42
1913-14	38,012.46
1914-15	41,743.85
1915-16	43,354.37

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. KAHN] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I do not know the merits of all the items in this bill, but I believe that this country can well afford to put up public buildings in the various cities to represent the majesty of the people of the United States. [Applause.]

I have an item in this bill for a new marine hospital at San Francisco. The buildings that stand there now were put up in 1875, with the understanding that they were to last 10 years, and then new substantial buildings would be erected. It is now 42 years since those buildings were put up. They are frame buildings, mere shells. The men who are in them are invalids, sick men, and if ever we have a fire in the marine hospital in San Francisco there is no doubt but that the casualty list will be exceedingly great.

Not long ago the grass in the vicinity of the marine hospital began to burn. The officers in charge of the hospital were fearful then that the buildings would take fire. They had to call out the soldiers from the Presidio to put out the fire, so as to save these buildings. Within the last three years we have had four fires in similar buildings in the Presidio of San Francisco, occupied by commissioned and noncommissioned officers and their families. In the four fires eight people lost their lives. Do we want to allow any condition of that kind to continue in this country? Do we want to have public buildings of that character representing the dignity and the power of the people of the United States? I think not. I believe there are many provisions in this bill that are equally meritorious with this one regarding a new marine hospital in San Francisco. I for one am not afraid to vote for this bill, and I shall do so with pleasure. [Applause.]

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, how much time did the gentleman yield back?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yielded back two minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, Texas has several items in this bill. There are very few towns in Texas with which I am not reasonably acquainted; and having examined those towns to my entire satisfaction, I take it for granted that they bear the same relation to public necessity that the other buildings in this bill bear to the rest of the country. If they do, there is no pork and no graft in this bill.

We are told that we do not need to build these post offices because we could rent and make out in some sort of other buildings. Why, certainly; and by the same reasoning we do not

need to build any splendid schoolhouses, because we could make out in a shack, and sit on a three-legged stool, like I did when I was a boy; but we have outgrown that system, and we stand to-day for progress. All this talk about voting for something we do not need does not appeal to me in this case, because I am sure if we do not absolutely need them now in most of the towns the time is not far distant when we will need them. And I remember that we nearly all voted practically to turn the whole Treasury over to the building of battleships and magnificent floating palaces; and, my God, I know we did not need them, and I pray to God that the time will never come when we shall need them. [Applause.] However, they may serve a good purpose yet. It is possible that we can lariat them to the bank of the ocean and have some of those vast military fandangoes and dances on the decks, where magnificent men with military bearing and epaulets on their shoulders and with coats cut away can waltz to music with women whose clothes are at half-mast. [Laughter.] And so it is possible that we can use them in that way; but so far as the service for which they are built is concerned, I see no immediate use for them, and anticipate that at least during the 18 years of their supposed efficiency we will never need them. Yet we spend hundreds of millions of dollars in anticipation of possible needs. So I am willing to risk a thousand dollars here and five thousand dollars there in the great interior of our country, in some town where the fellow who baptizes the earth with the briny dew that drops from the brow of industry in our fields can lift up his eyes and once in a while behold the flag that waves over a Government agency and a Government institution. [Applause.]

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR] is recognized for 18 minutes.

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago, on December 7, I placed in the RECORD some suggestions and criticisms in regard to the pending public-building bill. It has been charged that I did not deliver the speech on the floor. I secured all the time to which I was entitled—an hour and a quarter—and I endeavored during that time to answer all questions that were presented. I am not going to add to the information based on official data presented in that speech, but before we proceed to the consideration of this bill I wish to offer one or two further suggestions, which ought to be thought out carefully by this membership.

Mr. GORDON rose.

Mr. FREAR. I can not yield now. I have just started. The gentleman from Ohio may be with me, but I want to get this matter clearly before the House in the limited time allotted to me.

I call your attention to the fact that the two bills now awaiting immediate consideration before this House are the \$38,000,000 public-building bill and the \$38,000,000 river and harbor bill, which are both awaiting recognition from the Chair. A sum total of \$76,000,000 is asked for by these two bills at this time, and in the river and harbor bill only \$9,000,000 cash is asked out of \$47,000,000 authorizations, so the two bills really represent a total of \$114,000,000, with a \$300,000,000 deficit facing us in the Treasury, and direct taxation to be imposed to meet these extravagant bills.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to reply briefly to one or two things that have been suggested by committee members during the discussion. The chairman of the committee [Mr. CLARK of Florida], who has treated me with unusual courtesy, made the statement yesterday that this is a nonsectional bill, and that the comments made in my speech on the subject were unfortunate in that respect. I did not intend it to be understood as sectional because of any mere matter of locality. I wish to say that there is not a proposition in the river and harbor bill, North or South, or in this public-building bill, that is a worthy project that ought not to be given to the South as well as to the North. There is no distinction in locality. Extravagant projects in Wisconsin are just as bad as they are in Florida or in any other State. I will say this, too, that no matter where the project is located, it ought to be considered entirely upon its merits. But in my other speech I showed conclusively that 19 projects in this bill for one State in the South were in towns all having less than 4,000 people, and that brings right to my mind the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], who said that he had, I think, 28 projects in his own district worthy of immediate consideration, but these were ignored by the committee.

Mr. FESS. Eighteen.

Mr. FREAR. Eighteen projects in his own district that are on all fours with those in this bill—larger and more worthy, doubtless, than a majority of the 19 villages cared for in one

southern State which is of average size. I gave many such comparisons to indicate methods of distribution by the committee. The relative importance of projects is not considered here. It is the division of 300 projects among the membership of this House that makes it invulnerable. Do you not believe it? Is there any question about it? I leave it to members of the committee like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] and others who have here said that it is the fact. I do not need to emphasize it. No amendment can strike out one item from the bill because of that fact. What is the character of reports that are made before this committee in order to show value of projects? Who have appeared at the hearings? Does the committee ask for the opinions of experts? Do its members ask for advice from the Post Office Department or from the Treasury Department, or do these departments furnish reports as to the value of projects? No; the Public Buildings Committee declares to the Treasury Department, "We do not want to know your opinion about these things. You are asked not to give your judgment as to the necessity for a public building." That has been stated here by the chairman himself. These hearings as to public necessity are made up of statements by Congressmen alone, without exception men of high character, it is conceded, but that is the way the hearings are held which determine the character of items in the bill and their necessity. Congressmen want them in every case. The hearings show this to be a fact; and so, based on these hearings, in spite of protests of extravagance and waste of public funds, 300 buildings are distributed around the country in every State and in a large majority of the districts. Buildings and sites are mathematically and geographically distributed. That is the vice of omnibus bills. The pressure is hard in every community for public buildings. I do not believe, primarily, it is the fault of Members themselves. I say this in all fairness to the chairman of the committee, that his bill is as good, as he says, and as bad, as past bills—as good and bad as the bill of 1913. The chairman said two-thirds of the responsibility for that 1913 bill belonged to the party on this side of the aisle. There is no question about that, and I do not criticize individuals or political parties in this matter. They are nonpartisan bills, and that makes them so dangerous. The present bill contains hundreds of items. The Treasury Department of the present administration has said that 200 or more of these items are unprofitable for this country. How many of them? Two hundred; and I believe it can be established that far more than that number are unprofitable and wasteful, judging from the letters of the department—wasteful at any time, and particularly at this time.

Now, the chairman made another statement to which I will refer, but I am not going to reply to personalities. I have been criticized severely in the past on the floor of the House by Members for opposing wasteful omnibus bills, but it will not make the slightest difference with my attitude on this bill or on any other bill which I think is wrong and ought to be defeated. It has been suggested that it is unfortunate I am on the floor of the House. But I have recently been given the greatest indorsement ever given from that district. This indorsement, Mr. Chairman, I did not consider personal. I assumed it was in justification of the course that has led me in part to aid in defeating two river and harbor bills which thereby saved to the Government \$42,000,000. These were the 1914 and 1915 river and harbor bills, and I trust we will witness the defeat of this public-building bill, even though it has got some good items in it. And so with the \$38,000,000 river and harbor bill that is waiting to follow, and which, with this bill, has a tortuous course to travel before it ever becomes a law.

Mr. Chairman, it is an unpleasant duty, and I conceive it to be a duty, to attack many wasteful items when there are good items in the bill. It is unfortunate that the good are linked up with the bad, but it has been declared time and time again by Members in debate that not a single item can be stricken from the bill. They stand or fall together. Why? There are 300 Members here, and the assertion is made that if an item is dropped it loses the vote of that individual Member. That is the general understanding, and the effect is to hold the bill intact, like a river and harbor bill; you can not cut out any items, the only way is to defeat the bill.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] yesterday made some statements that I do not expect to reply to in a personal way, but to discuss impersonally. He said, "Will the gentleman from Wisconsin strike from the list the Wisconsin items, will he be consistent?" That has been the trouble with all the discussion in the House. Will you be consistent? I care not for the charge of inconsistency. A man trying a lawsuit tries to win if he believes it is right to win, even though

yesterday he thought it was wrong. You are not trying men's consistency by the merits of this bill. Consistency is only a jewel at rare times. It is an argument that will not deter those who realize the weakness of it. My own course I trust has been consistent in opposition to waste, but the measure and not the man is alone to be enacted into law or defeated.

Why should the gentleman from Pennsylvania ask if I am going to strike out the items for Wisconsin? I do not know whether the gentleman from Pennsylvania is here to-day or not, but I would like to make a suggestion to him. If the chairman of the River and Harbor Committee is here, he will bear testimony that I moved to strike out three-quarters of the upper Mississippi river proposition, involving \$2,000,000, in the pending bill; and upon that motion the committee struck out \$800,000. It runs about 125 miles past my district—the only project that touches the district—but it is waste, and I know it. I will put in the proof when the bill is reached. It is not a question of individual interest that should govern, if the item is wasteful. Why should the gentleman from Pennsylvania, with his two-million-dollar item for Philadelphia, in the river and harbor bill, and his \$750,000 in this bill, question what my action is going to be? What will his action be on bad items in both bills and on the bills themselves? If he believes the Wisconsin items should go out, he ought to move to strike them out. It is his duty as much as mine. I am not a prosecuting officer, but I am trying to give information as best I can as to the items in the bill. When the items are reached, let the record show for itself.

Mr. Chairman, the question has arisen about the accuracy of the Treasury Department's figures. To my mind the question whether \$10,000 in annual receipts should govern, as proposed by the committee, is immaterial; it is not material whether the annual receipts are \$15,000 or \$20,000, although I believe that the suggestion of the distinguished Speaker of this House is a good one. We ought to fix some permanent limit and make it a good large limit in receipts and then make it work automatically without bringing these omnibus bills into the House for discussion.

What possible justification can there be for having one locality where perhaps only one manufactory buys all of the postage stamps and thereby raises the receipts above \$10,000—why should that be justification for building a public building there? Receipts have no more relation to the necessity of putting up public buildings than has the collections of a street-car conductor to the cost of the car that he is running.

What is the ordinary business test to be applied by any municipality? Is it not a question of present expense and what will be the future and natural expense of administration? I will later discuss this matter of annual receipts when the bill comes up for amendments, but I have not the time to do so now.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; I yield to the chairman.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Would not the gentleman accept the postal receipts at a post office as a basis as to the needs of a public building?

Mr. FREAR. Not on any such basis as some items in this bill offer where the present rental, for illustration, is \$500 and the future cost of maintenance will reach approximately ten times that amount, or \$5,000 annually.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the gentleman believe that the Government is established for the purpose of being remunerative from its public buildings?

Mr. FREAR. No; not necessarily.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the gentleman believe that schools and churches should be destroyed because they do not pay in dollars and cents?

Mr. FREAR. Oh, no. I will go a little further than that, and I will say that I will give the benefit to the Government in certain cases, but I would not pay \$10 for a useless, extravagant building where we are paying \$1 now. The justification for a building must be based upon actual necessity for its use and reasonableness of the additional expense.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does not the gentleman think that in determining the question of the inequality, the upkeep, and the rental, etc., there ought to be taken into consideration the character of the quarters that the Government is now occupying, the rented quarters, as to their making for efficiency, and their sanitary condition and all that sort of thing?

Mr. FREAR. I will say this, that the chairman of the committee himself signed the report which says that in order to determine what should be taken into consideration—

Mr. BARKLEY rose.

Mr. FREAR. I can not yield further at this moment to the gentleman. I wish to reply to the gentleman from Florida. He declared in his report—and it is the right policy—that there should always be taken into consideration the interest, the cost of the janitor service, the cost of maintenance, in comparison with present rents, when considering new buildings, and I think that is the proper system.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. As one of the elements?

Mr. FREAR. Yes; but not necessarily the controlling element.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not the controlling element?

Mr. FREAR. I said that. Then, let us take the case of the gentleman who to-day is the Postmaster General of the United States. He was formerly a Member of this House. In that same report he says that there should be \$15,000 receipts annually instead of \$10,000, as proposed in the majority report of the Public Buildings Commission, \$1,000 annual rent, and that there should be at least a population of 5,000 people. That is his basis of determination of necessity. Then the Treasury Department placed the receipts at \$25,000 or more as the proper basis. But here we have in some cases in this bill receipts of not \$6,000 annually. What is the object of putting in a legal limit here attempting to govern the next Congress? You can not govern the next Congress. You do not recognize any such law in this Congress, because you have put in such items here as you choose. Who is governed by any law passed by a preceding Congress? No one; nor have they attempted to be, because these propositions are found before us in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the waste in this bill reaches to something like 200 items, according to the Treasury estimates. The chairman gave two illustrations yesterday; and I speak of this briefly because they are characteristic of many of the items in the bill. For instance, he said that in the case of Lewisburg, W. Va., there was a population of 803 people, as I recollect, and postal receipts of \$8,017, according to the 1915 report, which was available at the time the bill was introduced. That office was paying \$540 a year rent.

The estimated expense of a new building will be \$6,800 a year, at the amount named. This is twelve times as much as the rental there now, and that represents the additional cost of erecting a building at Lewisburg. Oh, you say, but there are other governmental activities.

Mr. Chairman, one member of the Public Buildings Committee introduced 11 building bills this session, and in 8 of those bills for his district which he proposed there were other governmental activities. Other offices were to be accommodated. It is easy to put governmental activities of various kinds at these places in order to qualify in insignificant villages, but you can form an idea of the unimportance of such arguments when I say that in Kentucky they ask for extra courthouses, while they have 12 Federal courthouses in that State to-day, twice as many as they have in Illinois. Think of the absurdity of this situation. Chicago, it is said, has a larger amount in the bill than many of the small towns put together. I do not know whether the necessity and cost is right or not; I do not know whether it is a proper item. No question has been raised. I think there may be some question, however, about some of these larger items as to their necessity at this time, but there are receipts in Chicago of over \$19,000,000 every year, enough to meet 600 of these other items, which boast of annual receipts of \$10,000—more than enough to counterbalance 600 such items, or double the entire number contained in this bill.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FREAR. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. Chicago has postal receipts of \$27,500,000 a year.

Mr. FREAR. Then, think how much greater the disparity. That represents eight or nine hundred of these struggling village items which have postal receipts of \$10,000 a year each. So that you see the relative importance is not determined by this question of \$10,000 revenue. Why should you build a \$30,000 post office simply because there is an annual revenue of \$10,000 obtained by the sale of postage stamps? You put a postage stamp on a letter to carry it to England or all around the world or to some point in this country. The revenue is not used to build public buildings, and when a public building is going to cost to maintain some five or six thousand dollars, as is shown to be the case at Lewisburg, W. Va., why do you want to increase it to that amount from \$500 or \$600 a year, which is now being paid for rent? That is what I have attempted to set forth in this discussion as a fundamental proposition. As I said, there is no question of sectionalism, but I have shown that in one State with 19 items for 12 districts every one of these items is in a town containing less than 4,000 inhabitants—items

placed in small towns in order to divide up the bill geographically and secure the support of a majority of the membership of the House for the bill. As the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] said, the omnibus bill is the vice permeating the whole proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT]. [Applause.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I am the oldest member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in point of service. I was placed there first by the distinguished ex-Speaker of this House, my personal friend, Mr. CANNON. I have served through Democratic and Republican administrations. I believe that I can say with truth, that no matter whether this committee has been composed in its membership of a majority of Democrats or of Republicans, it has been an absolutely impartial committee. We have tried to do right and to do fairly. We have not recognized the argument that gentlemen have made here frequently, that only the great cities were entitled to recognition from this Government in their post-office buildings or for the housing of other governmental activities. We believe that the people in the country, who pay the majority of the taxes of the Nation, ought sometimes to have a look-in on what the Government is doing. We do not believe that merely because brick and mortar and people have been concentrated in some particular center, that therefore the people of all the other sections of the country have no right to recognition by their Government. I have served under various chairmen of this committee. It was my privilege, as the acting chairman of the committee four years ago, when the chairman of the committee, Mr. SHEPPARD, of Texas, was made Senator, to have charge of the bill that was adopted at that time. I remember that the same kind of arguments were made at that time as have been made to-day by gentlemen who are members of this committee, but who to-day have taken very different positions from those they maintained at that time.

I remember when the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] had an opportunity to vote for a motion for instruction to the conference committee, offered by Mr. HARDWICK, of Georgia, in which the Senate put on this provision:

No contract authorized by any section of this act for the erection of a building to be used exclusively as a post office, or for the purchase of sites for such buildings, shall be entered into nor shall public money be expended for such purposes until the receipts of such post office for which any such building or site is intended shall amount to more than \$10,000 per annum.

On that motion, Mr. Chairman, a yea-and-nay vote was demanded, and among the distinguished gentlemen—consisting of 190 for to 86 against the adoption of that amendment—I find the names of ASHBROOK and BARNHART among those who led the opposition. [Applause.] And yet, my friends, wonderfully consistent, now come up four years later—it was a Republican administration then and it seems that the gentlemen at that time did not care how much might be expended, I will not say for the purpose of embarrassing a Republican administration, but at any rate they did not want that kind of an amendment put on to hold us down to items for buildings and sites where the receipts did not exceed \$10,000.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. I will yield for a question.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if the conditions of the Treasury, the general conditions, were very much different four years ago from what they are now. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BURNETT. Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, that is true [applause on the Republican side], comparatively; but still, Mr. Chairman, we are to-day a richer Nation by perhaps one hundredfold, or at least fiftyfold, than we were at that time. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Our resources have increased and the revenues of the Government have proportionately increased. Democrats ought to be the last men to change their position by reason of a change in the condition of the Treasury [applause], because, Mr. Chairman, under the four years of Democratic administration the bow of prosperity has hung over this country from the rock-ribbed coast of Maine to the golden shores of California and from where the aurora borealis spans the Alaskan coast to the orange groves of Florida. [Applause.] And I believe that the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Ohio are the only two gentlemen under the Stars and Stripes who do not realize the increased prosperity of our country. But, Mr. Chairman, has the gentleman again been consistent? I am not criticizing him for passing under his

leadership the bill for an increased pension to the widows of Union soldiers. Nor did his colleague from Ohio [Mr. KEY] criticize him by the question he asked him, but only pointed out his inconsistency. I have more pensioners of Union soldiers and more widows of Union soldiers in my district than any five districts in the State of Alabama, and I do not chide the gentleman for that. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman believed it was in his political interest to get the votes of the people in those splendid districts of the North he was willing then to increase the burden upon the Treasury from twelve to fifteen and perhaps twenty million dollars without ever blinking an eye at the increase. Oh, the consistency of the gentleman!

Mr. ASHBROOK. I would like to ask my friend if he was not in favor of that pension bill?

Mr. BURNETT. Absolutely, and in favor of this bill, too; and hence I am not inconsistent. [Applause.] We are not a pauperized Nation, and I am sorry to hear a Democrat here admit that we are. [Applause.] Oh, shame upon any man who in four brief years has changed his position when he said then that no matter how small a town was or how short its receipts were it ought then to have received an appropriation for a public building and yet who now, under the administration of his party, in effect says we are too poor to let the people in the rural districts of this country receive a slight evidence of the great prosperity of a great and grand Nation. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BURNETT. I will.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman if the condition of the Treasury, so far as the revenue receipts are concerned, is not in a better condition than it ever was at any time during the Republican rule?

Mr. BURNETT. Absolutely; far better. And, Mr. Chairman, I am one of those who stood against the amendment of the Senate to an increase of more than \$100,000,000 for battleships in days of profound peace, when there is less reason for our fearing war than there has ever been, and if the gentleman and other gentlemen had been as consistent as I have been, there would not have been even the trouble in regard to Treasury receipts and Treasury deficit.

Mr. SIMS. Emphasizing what the gentleman says, is it not a fact that all the deficit and all the arrears in payment of bills is due to the fact of the instrumentalities of destruction instead of production?

Mr. BURNETT. Absolutely; and I have—

Mr. SIMS. And these Republicans are the very men who howled louder than anybody?

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to be discourteous to any gentleman, but I want to say just a word or two about the great pork-barrel statesman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], who has been posing for years, at least I have not heard of his doing anything else, as the great pork-barrel reformer.

Mr. Chairman, first answering one or two statements of the gentleman from Indiana, the gentleman says this is a fair bill, but he is opposed to it because he is afraid another body will destroy the efforts of this body to reform the administration of these authorizations. The gentleman is a good parliamentarian and yet he certainly forgets that we will have a say on the action of that other body, and that, following the usual course, the distinguished chairman of this committee and myself, as Democratic members of the conference committee, and the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. AUSTIN], as the minority member, will have something to say about that, and that this House will finally pass on the action of that other body. It is a strange kind of argument that the gentleman from Indiana uses when he says that he is opposed to this bill on account of the present condition by which the architect's office is four years behind and puts a building where it ought not to be in his town, and yet the gentleman admits that if this bill is defeated that very condition will continue, and that this bill itself remedies that very condition.

That is a strange kind of inconsistency in the gentleman. Although, Mr. Chairman, I have been here for 18 years I have secured but two buildings for the district which I have the honor to represent, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] in a brief service of 8 or 10 years has, I believe, secured three. And the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], from whose eyes the scales have so suddenly fallen, who has undergone this wonderful conversion, aye, almost resurrection, in the course of a few years, has himself been the beneficiary of two buildings and two sites. But now it is "pork barrel." And the gentleman from Wisconsin—

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. With pleasure, but just briefly.

Mr. FESS. Was the gentleman who is now on his feet the one to whom the gentleman referred, the gentleman from Ohio? Who was the one?

Mr. BURNETT. I referred to the gentleman leading this fight against the bill, a member of this committee [Mr. ASHBROOK]. I do not know how much the gentleman, Mr. Fess, has in the bill. If he had a good case and was active for his people he has gotten something. If he has not, then it is his own fault and not the fault of the committee. And all I can say is—and I do not say that, because I love the gentleman, and he knows it—

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. For a question.

Mr. FESS. For just one statement. This present gentleman has not received anything in his district, and if this bill is the policy he ought to receive 18.

Mr. BURNETT. Has the gentleman even asked for one for his people?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. He has? Has the gentleman come before the committee and asked the committee to give him one?

Mr. FESS. It was not necessary.

Mr. BURNETT. The gentleman has a proposition in the bill?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], the great opponent of the "pork barrel," the great reformer, is scarcely accurate in any statement he makes, though not intentionally inaccurate. I believed when the gentleman first began his fanfaronade against pork it was a matter of pure cussedness. I was with the gentleman and 40 or 50 other gentlemen over in Hawaii two years ago, and the close association that I enjoyed with the gentleman led me to believe that it was not pure cussedness, but that the gentleman goes off without information and is willing to take the unverified statements of the Architect's Office in the Treasury Department, or of the American Institute of Architects, in order to get his basis for an attack on this bill without an investigation.

Three years ago the gentleman made an attack on a proposition for Dam 12 on the Coosa River, Ala. He read a letter from some one who purported to be from Montgomery, whom my colleague [Mr. DENT] representing that district never could find, and whom I never could find. He read it and inserted it in the RECORD. In this letter it was stated that as a result of backwater from that dam there was a grave malarial condition produced, that bacteria was present, and that the people were suffering disease and death from it.

A number of suits were brought involving that very proposition, and one of the most distinguished physicians in the world, Dr. Gorgas, visited the place, and examined it and analyzed the water. The board of physicians of that county visited the place and made careful investigations, and every one of them decided that there was no such thing. Case after case was tried by juries of the neighbors of the people bringing them, and in each case they decided there was not a word of truth in the statement in regard to the prevalence of bacteria to an extent to produce sickness or death.

Now, I am not charging that my good friend has made those charges on his own initiative and on his own responsibility, but he goes off halfcocked, on half-baked statements of people who are interested. I ask him now, when he attacks projects that are in the river and harbor bill or other measures, that he inform himself and find out the source of his information.

What are we going to do about it?

SEVERAL MEMBERS. Pass it.

Mr. BURNETT. There is no doubt about that. Somebody says the Senate is not going to pass it. Mr. Chairman, I thank God that as a result of an initiative in this administration within the last few years the American Senators have been made responsible to the American people—those who elect them. And if it is true that there are Senators who are willing to fritter away millions on great armies and on immense battleships, while their constituents never see the eagle upon an American "twenty," or even the buffalo on an American nickel, so far as Government expenditures are concerned, and if those Senators are willing to take that responsibility, gentlemen, let them do it. It is not your responsibility and it is not mine. I never yet, Mr. Chairman, "crooked the pregnant hinges of the knee that thrift might follow fawning."

Men say it will receive a veto. That is not your responsibility, Mr. Chairman, nor mine. What do we owe to the boy and the girl and the man and the woman back in your district? What do we owe to our own consciences? It is a question for every man to decide upon his oath. And the man who shirks his re-

sponsibility because he is afraid of the President, afraid of the Postmaster General, afraid of the Secretary of the Treasury, or afraid of the Senate is a coward and unworthy the position of representative of brave American people. [Applause.]

Now, they talk about the upkeep. The distinguished gentleman, my colleague on the committee, Mr. ASHBROOK, referred to what the upkeep of these buildings would be, according to statements of the Treasury Department. Mr. Chairman, in all common sense, ought there to be any more expense in the upkeep of a \$25,000 building in Hazard, Ky., or in some little place in my district or yours, than there is in the upkeep of a good rented post office now at the same place?

Why is it necessary to employ janitors and charwomen? And yet for the purpose of trying to deter Members of Congress from doing their duty that kind of stuff is undertaken to be rammed down the throats of men who are responsible to the people who sent them here. Every man knows that that is merely for the purpose of creating sentiment against the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notifies the gentleman at his request that he has used 20 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Give it to them, little giant! [Laughter.]

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, the appropriations in this bill are not all or the majority part of it. As long as I have been serving on this committee, through Democratic and Republican administrations, we have been trying to get the Supervising Architect's Office to adopt standards for buildings so far as it is possible to do so. We have not been able to do it. I believe that if this bill is adopted, by the expeditiousness that will be gained and the economy that will be secured there will be a worthy achievement.

But that is not all. We provide for the reorganization of the Supervising Architect's Office and the inauguration of a commission. Suppose we do pay a good architect \$10,000 or \$15,000 a year. Is not that cheaper than to pay these high-priced architects 6 per cent commission on every two or three million dollar building for which they prepare the plans and specifications? A \$3,000,000 building at 6 per cent makes an architect's commission of \$180,000. I believe it will take \$10,000 a year to get an absolutely competent architect; but if it did, would it not be better than to pay an outside architect \$180,000 every time a \$3,000,000 building, a building of monumental size, is constructed? The big architects, many of them, throughout the country are fighting this bill because they know it will deprive them of the graft they are now getting from the Government, sitting like vultures, eager to prey upon the American Treasury, and crying "Pork barrel!" and getting the great metropolitan newspapers of the country to denounce this bill as "pork." [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time to the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back the remainder of his time.

Mr. BURNETT. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. BURNETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. FREAR], in answer to the challenge of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE], says it is not his duty to move to strike out the items from his own State. Mr. Chairman, if it is his duty to criticize them, is it his duty to sit stolidly here and see them go in without attempting to strike them out?

Mr. FREAR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURNETT. Yes.

Mr. FREAR. Does not the gentleman think he is anticipating the situation?

Mr. BURNETT. Oh, the gentleman himself anticipated it in trying to answer the unanswerable argument of my friend from Philadelphia [Mr. MOORE] when he said it is not his duty to strike them out, but our duty to leave them out, or the chairman's duty to move to strike them out if the items are wrong. Then the gentleman can not sit here under his oath and refuse to make the motion, whether he comes from Wisconsin or Alabama.

Mr. Chairman, there is no sectionalism in me. I came on in the dark days of the Civil War. I thought at one time that gentlemen away up in the cold regions of the North had hoofs and horns. [Laughter.] But when I met gentlemen from that section all over the country, and especially since it has been my honor and my privilege to associate with them here, I have learned that on great questions among gentlemen of honor there is no North and no South, there is no East and no West.

I hear some small men here raising that cry. It reminds me of Mose Smith, a boy who used to go to the Methodist camp meetings in Alabama. I am an orthodox Methodist, Mr. Chair-

man—orthodox on the doctrine of "falling from grace." I not only believe in the doctrine, but I practice the faith. Mose Smith was one of the bad boys that used to attend our camp meetings. One night, when the altar services grew warm, he got one of those black racer snakes that we have down in Alabama and threw it over the altar, created consternation, and broke up the meeting. The next day he was captured and put into the chain gang for 12 months for disturbing religious worship, a punishment which he deserved, and a year later, when he had been released from the chain gang, he came to the meeting again, a much wiser and better boy. Among us Methodists we think the presiding elder is the "big gun," and we put him up to preach on Sunday. The presiding elder began his sermon with these words as his text, "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness." Mose Smith thought that had some reference to the serpent that had gotten him into prison 12 months before, and he could not stand it any longer. He jumped up and threw the hymn book at the preacher and said, "Parson, stop that right now. I don't want to hear another word about that darned old snake story. I am willing to let bygones be bygones." [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, when I hear men raising a sectional cry on any of these questions, I am reminded of Mose Smith—"I don't want to hear any more about that darned old snake story. I am willing to let bygones be bygones." [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc., That to enable the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to give effect to and execute the provisions of existing legislation authorizing the acquisition of land for sites or the enlargement thereof, and the erection, enlargement, extension, remodeling, or repair of public buildings in the several cities hereinafter enumerated, the limit of cost heretofore fixed by Congress therefor be, and the same is hereby, increased, respectively, as follows, and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the completion of each of said buildings within its respective limit of cost, including site.*

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether under the phraseology of the paragraph that has just been read the Secretary of the Treasury would have authority to purchase a site, for which an appropriation has already been authorized in the act of three years ago, to the extent of the additional appropriation herein carried?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not exactly understand the gentleman's question. Was the site authorized in the bill of 1913?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes. Now, with the additional authorization here, would the Secretary of the Treasury have the authority to use the entire amount for the site only?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Is the amount increased in this item?

Mr. STAFFORD. It is indefinite. It is provided for in one of the items following here.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Which is the item?

Mr. STAFFORD. I am referring particularly to the United States post office, west side, Milwaukee, \$100,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. There is no question about that. This is an increase of the limit of cost heretofore paid. I understand the gentleman's question now. This says:

*That to enable the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States to give effect to and execute the provisions of existing legislation authorizing the acquisition of land for sites or the enlargement thereof, and the erection, enlargement, extension, remodeling, or repair of public buildings in the several cities hereinafter enumerated, the limit of cost heretofore fixed by Congress therefor be, and the same is hereby, increased, respectively, as follows.*

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman stops there, but let him read on—

*and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to enter into contracts for the completion of each of said buildings within its respective limit of cost, including site.*

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would not that mean that the aggregate expenditure for such a building must be within the total amount appropriated for at that place?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Oh, no; not at all. This is the language that has always been used in this bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I was fearful that that latter clause would limit the prior phraseology, so that the full amount could not be expended for site alone.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; the full amount can be expended for site. There is no question about that.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Bath, Me., \$10,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I notice that the bill as introduced called for \$30,000,

and that \$10,000 was allowed by the committee. I note that the population in 1900 was 10,477, and that 10 years afterwards the population was 9,396, a loss of over 1,000 people.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. What place is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. JAMES. Bath, Me. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he knows the amount that was originally appropriated?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not quite understand the gentleman's question.

Mr. JAMES. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee what was the amount originally granted for the post office and site at Bath, Me.?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The act of May 30, 1908, authorized the extension of the building, with a limit of cost of \$35,000; the act of June 25, 1910, increased that limit to \$55,000. In awarding a contract for the extension of the building it was found necessary to omit work in connection with the approaches which were originally intended, and also some other items in order to bring the amount within the balance estimated. It is estimated that the increase of the limit of \$10,000 would be sufficient to make the approach work along the lines originally contemplated. That is the report of the committee.

Mr. JAMES. Making it \$35,000 altogether?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; \$65,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Chicago, Ill., \$4,250,000.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The story of Chicago's growth and progress is more marvelous than can be told by man. I have seen its population grow from 150,000 to 2,500,000. When we put up a building for a post office in 1896 it had 121,000 square feet of floor space. It soon proved to be inadequate. We erected a new building in 1906, with 246,000 feet of floor space, which was inadequate from the day we entered it. By remodeling the building in several ways we were enabled by the use of the basement to get 423,000 square feet. The revenues of the post office when we entered that building were \$12,000,000 a year. For the calendar year closed December 31, 1916, the revenues were \$27,500,000. To-day the needs of the postal service in Chicago require 1,000,000 square feet of floor space. Ten years from to-day, I have no doubt, if the present rate of growth continues, we will need 1,500,000 square feet of floor space. The city continues to grow with such marvelous rapidity that no man can to-day prophesy what space will be adequate for the postal service of the future.

It is because of the experience of the past and because of the present needs and also the needs of the days to come that we require so large an amount of money as we provide in this item to add to the appropriation which we already have available for the purchase of a site for a new building in which to conduct the postal business of Chicago. To-day there are 7,300 men employed in the Chicago post office. They are growing in number every year to meet the needs of the increased population and the increased business of this great office.

Fifty-eight per cent of all the mail arriving in the city of Chicago comes within less than 80 rods of the site which is proposed to be purchased for the new building. It may be said that we are asking for a lot of money, but the site upon which we have the present building cost \$1,000,000, and if the Government of the United States wishes to sell that site to-day, it can be sold for \$12,000,000. We can not meet Chicago's growing needs by even the appropriation which we are making for the purchase of a site to-day. The sooner the Government of the United States begins the erection of a new building in which to conduct this great business of Chicago's postal service the sooner we will be able to conduct the business with the dispatch with which it ought to be conducted in order that the rest of the country may be properly served by the expeditious movement of the mails through Chicago.

Chicago is the clearing house for the movement of the mails from the East, from the West, from the North, and the South into every section of the Union. There is not a city anywhere within the confines of the Union that is not as much interested in having adequate facilities for the Postal Service in Chicago as is Chicago itself. To-day the people of Chicago out of their private purse are spending more than \$100,000,000 every year in the construction of 65 miles of buildings to house the ever-increasing population of that great city.

There are 1,121 mail trains arriving and departing every 24 hours over the 39 trunk-line railroads entering Chicago, representing more than 150,000 of 250,000 miles of iron track, reaching every section of the Union.

Chicago has its hands upon the traffic of the Nation and notes every pulse beat of the business of the continent. Chicago is the great center, the commercial heart throb of the American Continent, whence more than 4,000 passenger trains arrive and depart every day. Seven hundred million people ride on the trains in the United States every year, and 1 out of every 7 must pass through Chicago in order to reach his destination. So that when we get the \$4,250,000 appropriation which this bill proposes and the site for the post office is purchased with it and the \$1,750,000 now available we will still be obliged to come to Congress for money to erect the building; and you need not be surprised if when we come we shall be compelled to ask for not five millions, not six millions, but fifteen million dollars with which to construct a building which will be adequate for the business of the Postal Service in that great city. It is not alone the postal business of Chicago which we seek to facilitate by this appropriation, but it is the postal business of the Union as well. We of Chicago realize that this appropriation is not being made on the recommendation of any Member of the House or of the 10 men who represent Chicago here; it is being made because of the needs of the growing Postal Service of the country, for Chicago is so situated geographically that it has become the clearing house for the Postal Service, reaching every section of the Nation. Chicago comes to you through her Representatives, then, to bespeak early and favorable action not only on this appropriation for the purchase of a site but a further appropriation of money necessary to erect a building in which to conduct the business of the country which goes through the post office of this imperial city of the Central West.

Now is the time to prepare for the future. Land values are increasing every day; available sites are few. The new building should be located to the best advantage, having the future in mind. Economy of operation is more important than all else, and it is with this in view that we urge present action to the end that the only available site may not pass beyond the possibility of purchase. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Narragansett Pier, R. I., \$10,000.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The amount asked for at Narragansett Pier, R. I., was \$10,000, of which \$5,000 was allowed. The population of this town in 1890 was 1,408, and in 1900 it was 1,523, and 1,250 in 1910. I would like to ask the gentleman the original amount appropriated for Narragansett Pier?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The gentleman wants to know the original amount authorized?

Mr. JAMES. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Sixty-nine thousand dollars.

Mr. JAMES. I would like to ask the gentleman if any hearings were held on the request of an increase of the amount by \$5,000?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think there were no hearings other than the reports of the Treasury Department, which I will give the gentleman, if he desires to hear them.

Mr. JAMES. I just want to know the original amount.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at York, Pa., \$25,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to line 4, page 4, for the purpose of offering an amendment. My attention was distracted at the time that the Clerk read that portion of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to return to line 4, page 4. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, following line 4, insert the following:

"United States post office at Waterloo, N. Y., \$9,000."

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will state that the original amount authorized for this place was \$55,000. There were some expenditures on the part of the Supervising Architect's Office for advertising, and so forth. The amount available now is \$47,700. They have advertised several times for bids, and the bids were \$54,750 and \$52,000, and along there. The Supervising Architect's Office states that it is absolutely necessary to have \$9,000 more before they can get a bid within which they can construct this building. The matter has been pending for a long time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making an inquiry of the chair-

man respecting the item in lines 9 and 10 for the post office at York, Pa. There is an increase provided here of \$25,000. It has been my good fortune on more than one occasion to visit the magnificent building in that city, which was constructed in commemoration of the fact that the Continental Congress back in 1778 happened to hold a session there. The building must have cost several hundred thousand dollars, as I estimate it, and it seemed to be entirely complete and finished. What is it that calls for the additional appropriation? It is a new building, completed only within the last few years. It is very ornate in the interior, finished with marble and bronze. I can not conceive of a more lavishly ornamented and furnished building than the one at York, Pa., and it is hard for me to conceive why there should be any additional appropriation called for.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I will state that the Treasury Department says, in response to an inquiry as to the necessity for the increase, that the original design of the building contemplated the use of statuary. The statues were not included in the general contract, but the sum of \$15,000 was set aside for the purpose. Afterwards there was found necessity for the construction of a wall in connection with the approaches, and that exhausted the amount reserved for statuary. The building is now completed and equipped and there are no funds available for the statuary, which would add greatly to the appearance of the structure. It is estimated that the increase in the bill, \$25,000, will be sufficient to provide for the statuary in keeping with the design of the building. This being a historical building, it was originally contemplated that this statuary should be placed upon it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the information furnished by the gentleman gives me what I desired to know. I could not conceive how the building could be otherwise than finished, except for some further ornamentation.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office and Subtreasury at Boston, Mass., \$250,000.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by inserting between lines 15 and 16, on page 4, the following: "United States post office and courthouse at Aberdeen, Miss., limit of cost, \$20,000."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. It is quite a mooted question whether there is need of Subtreasuries throughout the United States except those at New York, Chicago, and San Francisco. The matter has been seriously considered by the Committee on Appropriations of abolishing the other Subtreasuries. It has been contended that the Federal Reserve banks would ultimately and in the near future take over the work of the Subtreasuries. The House declined, when this question was under consideration this session, to discontinue the use of these Subtreasuries; but I wish to inquire what is the need, in view of the unsettled condition of the policy of the Government, to provide for the Subtreasury at Boston as an adjunct to the post office?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin the Subtreasury occupies a very small portion of the post office in the city of Boston. They are both in the same building, but the Subtreasury occupies only part of the second floor in the post office. The greater part of this appropriation is to go for repairs on the post office itself. The courts are in the post-office building, the United States district attorney's offices are in the building, so that all of this appropriation is to be used almost exclusively to make repairs in the post office itself.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the money is not to be utilized for Subtreasury purposes, I have no objection to the item. If it is going to be used for such purpose and applied to the Subtreasury part, why, there could be good argument raised against it. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. BORLAND. Mr. Chairman, I renew the amendment of the gentleman to strike out the last word. I assume the condition in Boston in postal matters is similar to the condition now in most of the big centers of business population in the United States. The postal business of those centers is growing very rapidly on account of two factors. One is the parcel post and the other is the postal savings bank. Additional quarters have to be provided in all city post offices for postal savings banks. But, more than that, a great deal of additional space is made necessary for the parcel post. I do not know what the plan adopted in Boston is or what the plan adopted in Chicago or other big centers, but not very long ago we had to meet that condition in my city of Kansas City, and it was decided, after a personal visit from the Secretary of the Treasury and Assist-

ant Secretary Newton, that the only solution in the future for this tremendous growth of postal business was to separate, so far as possible, the parcel-post business and the blue-tag mail and second-class mail from the first-class mail and provide a system in the big cities of a terminal post office. Now, when we reach the Kansas City item you will notice that that is purely the terminal post office. The uptown post office is built on high-priced ground, which now can not be enlarged to meet the growing postal needs of the city, and will be entirely devoted to the courts, and the down-town post office, with all the Federal activities located there—the Immigration Service, and the railway valuation, and the grain inspection, and the pure food and drugs act, and the Department of Justice, and so on—all of the mail will be collected and distributed at the terminal post office, which adjoins the Union Terminal. That will not be transported uptown and back again, as it has been in the past. That is the only possible way in which provision can be made for an extension of this business. Now, I take it that the expansion in Boston is not due to any Subtreasury they have there, and I would not be surprised if it were not true they are going to use all of this space for legitimate postal needs and, in addition, to the probable needs of the activities of the Government housed elsewhere in the city of Boston. When we reach the item of the terminal post office I want to state to the committee what I think will be the future plan of the Government in regard to providing for the expansion of mail facilities in the great mail centers of the country.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Decatur, Ill., \$50,000.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 14 after the figures "\$50,000," insert:  
"United States post office at Iowa City, Iowa, \$100,000."

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is an item for Iowa City, Iowa, one of the largest growing cities of Iowa, and the first capital of Iowa, a place where one of the great universities of this country is located. Now, this item is not one for which I have asked. It is one that the post-office inspectors themselves have recommended. Now, gentlemen, talk about consistency and about being fair; I am not afraid to defend the things you are doing in this bill, but you do not do the things that you ought to do, you are not consistent. I am not going to take up very much of the time of this great committee, but I am going to read to you a letter written to-day from the Treasury Department in regard to this item.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Yes, sir.

Mr. GORDON. What was the population of this town at the last census?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I will tell the gentleman all about that before I get through.

Mr. GORDON. Has the gentleman presented this matter to the committee?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. I did and I will let the committee explain why the item is not in if they have any explanation.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
Washington, January 17, 1917.

Hon. HARRY E. HULL,  
United States House of Representatives.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Referring to your personal call in regard to the proposed enlargement of the Federal building at Iowa City, Iowa, you are advised that the department is in receipt of a communication from the Postmaster General, under date of August 26, 1916, containing the following information:

"In view of the fact that the workroom contains only 1,500 square feet of floor space, while 3,400 square feet are needed at the present time, and approximately 4,500 square feet will be required 10 years hence, it is recommended that the necessary steps be taken looking to the extension of the building so that not less than 4,500 square feet of floor space will be available in the workroom."

The department is also advised that the rural carriers are located in the basement of the building, without proper supervision, and much time is wasted in carrying the mail there from the workroom floor. The parcel-post mail, it is understood, is also handled in the basement without adequate facilities for protection. These conditions are not only unsatisfactory, but the mailing division is cramped for room and the conditions appear to be constantly growing worse because of the increase in business. The postal receipts for the fiscal year 1905 were \$41,006.40, for the fiscal year 1915 were \$81,936.73, and for the fiscal year 1916 were \$83,496.13.

The report of this department to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, under date of July 15, 1916, on bill H. R. 16581, estimated that an extension covering 5,500 square feet ground area would be required, and that the cost of same would be \$80,000, including the necessary alterations and repairs to the present building. As the lot is not of sufficient area to accommodate the required extension, it is thought necessary to acquire more land adjoining the site, which it

is estimated will require \$20,000 additional, making a total of \$100,000 for the purchase of additional land and the construction of the extension.

Respectfully,

B. R. NEWTON,  
Assistant Secretary.

That is the report of the Treasury Department. The population of Iowa City has nearly doubled since 1905. It is over 12,000 to-day.

Mr. GORDON. What was it by the census in 1910?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. It was 10,007 in 1910.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to oppose an amendment of this kind, but the bill was introduced very late. There is a building at Iowa City now. I have no doubt it is inadequate; but there never has been any hearing upon this proposition, and there never has been any report from the department on it. For that reason I shall certainly have to oppose this amendment.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Was it my fault that there was not any hearing? Did not I ask for one?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not know whose fault it was. The subcommittee has had it in charge and held the hearings. All I know is that there was not any hearing on this; but the gentleman did have a hearing upon a bill which was included in this bill and taken care of, but we could not, of course, put this item in the bill without knowing anything more about it than we do, and I shall therefore have to oppose it.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. May I ask a question?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Have you held a hearing upon any more evidence than you have right there in the letter of the Post Office Department?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not know. We might want more evidence than that; yes. We have differed very materially with the department on some of these propositions.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I think it is evident that the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury are against this bill, or are certainly opposed to many items in it. Now, both of these officials of the administration, in the letter read in the hearing of the committee here, have practically indorsed this proposition, so that it meets with the approval of those in high authority who are criticizing most of the items in this bill.

This is one of the most congested post offices to which the attention of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds has been called, and I exonerate the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] from any failure to do his duty. It was not his fault that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds had no opportunity to hear his case, for he was persistent, he was anxious, and through no fault of his did the committee fail to have his case presented; and I want to say it is just as meritorious and deserving of the support of this House as the other items contained in this bill, and I hope this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. AUSTIN. Always.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is this excluded from the bill because it had the indorsement of both the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster General? [Laughter.]

Mr. AUSTIN. No. Their indorsement came here under today's date, and I am always anxious and willing to vote for any recommendation for an appropriation the Secretary of the Treasury or the Postmaster General or anybody else will recommend. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Was not the real reason why this was not included because it happened that this gentleman had two meritorious projects in his district and he was given only one by the committee?

Mr. AUSTIN. That is not any argument against his amendment.

Mr. TILSON. That is so; and I am in favor of it.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. STEENERSON. I would like to ask the Chairman if it is a fact that the reason why this district is not given this post office is because the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] already has a project in this bill?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. There is another project in this bill. Mr. STEENERSON. Is it the plan of the committee to give only one project to each district?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; it is not.

Mr. STEENERSON. I know I have had two very meritorious projects. [Laughter.] The receipts in one place were \$18,000, and in the other \$20,000, and the committee gave me only one.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I want to say to the gentleman that this bill is not constructed as to districts at all. We have attempted to sift out from the various districts what we consider to be the most meritorious projects.

Mr. STEENERSON. Does not the gentleman think if he adopted this amendment he would be giving a precedent favorable to my case?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. If this bill is loaded down by amendments the whole thing will fall. That is the size of it.

Mr. STEENERSON. But mine are meritorious.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, others are equally meritorious all over the country. But it is utterly impossible to take care of them all, and if the committee undertakes to load this bill down with amendments, then the whole bill falls.

Mr. STEENERSON. Is it not a fact that one district in the United States is given three distinct projects in this bill, or in fact four projects?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. It may be possible; but as I told the gentleman before, we have not constructed this bill upon the line of giving each district an item. We have constructed it upon the line of taking care of the meritorious projects as far as we could.

Mr. STEENERSON. Oh, well, the populations of one district are approximately the same as of the other, and they ought to receive about the same consideration.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman from Florida has stated that the bill is not constructed upon district lines. Has he in mind any district in a Northern State which had already received more than one project? If so, I would be glad to know the district.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. REILLY], I think, has two. I think I could name many more if I tried.

Mr. CRAMTON. I would be very much interested in hearing them.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Does the gentleman insist that this is a sectional bill after the figures that have been produced here?

Mr. CRAMTON. I am asking for information from the chairman on that very point.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am trying to give the information to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman from Florida does not know, surely I do not know.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am naming the district of the gentleman from Wisconsin. He has two items in the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is that the only case?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; the district represented by Judge TOWNER has more than one, and the district of the gentleman from Massachusetts over here has three.

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota withdraws his pro forma amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States post office at Flint, Mich., \$100,000.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KELLEY: Page 5, line 16—

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, before the amendment is reported, will not the gentleman from Florida move that the committee rise? There is another little matter to come before the House.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CLINE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that

committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 18994) to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings; to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings; to authorize the erection and completion of certain public buildings; to authorize the purchase of sites for certain public buildings; to abolish the Office of Supervising Architect of the Treasury and to create and organize in the Treasury Department a Bureau of Public Buildings and define its duties, powers, and jurisdiction; to create and establish the office of commissioner of public buildings; to fix the salary and prescribe the duties and powers of the said commissioner of public buildings; to create a board of estimates and prescribe its duties and powers; to provide for the standardization of certain classes of public buildings, and for other purposes, and came to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 1093. An act to permit the Denison Coal Co. to relinquish certain lands embraced in its Choctaw and Chickasaw coal lease and to include within said lease other lands within the segregated coal area.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—REPORT OF NAVY-YARD COMMISSION (H. DOC. NO 1946).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and (with the accompanying papers) referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith, as required by the provisions of the Act of Congress making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917 (the First Preliminary Report of the Navy Yard Commission), the appointment of which was authorized by said Act.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 17, 1917.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE—DEATH OF ADMIRAL DEWEY (H. DOC. NO. 1945).

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed:

*To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

It is with the deepest regret that I announce to the Congress the death of Admiral George Dewey at 5:56 o'clock on the afternoon of yesterday, the sixteenth of January, at his residence in this city.

Admiral Dewey entered the naval service of the country as an acting midshipman from the first congressional district of Vermont on September 23, 1854; was graduated from the Naval Academy as Midshipman June 11, 1858; served with distinction throughout the war of 1861-1865; and thirty years later had risen to the rank of Commodore. It was as Commodore that he rendered the service in the action of Manila Bay which has given him a place forever memorable in the naval annals of the country. At the time of his death he held the exceptional rank of The Admiral of the Navy by special Act of Congress. During the later years of his life he was the honored President of the General Board of the Navy, to whose duties he gave the most assiduous attention and in which office he rendered a service to the Navy quite invaluable in its sincerity and quality of practical sagacity.

It is pleasant to recall what qualities gave him his well-deserved fame; his practical directness, his courage without self-consciousness, his efficient capacity in matters of administration, the readiness to fight without asking any questions or hesitating about any detail. It was by such qualities that he continued and added luster to the best traditions of our Navy. He had the stuff in him which all true men admire and upon which all statesmen must depend in hours of peril. The people and the Government of the United States will always rejoice to perpetuate his name in all honor and affection.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 17, 1917.

NIAGARA RIVER.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on Senate joint resolution 186, authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversion of the water from Niagara River, for printing under the rule.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF PUBLIC-BUILDINGS BILL.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the public-buildings bill may have liberty to revise and extend their remarks for five legislative days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken on the public-buildings bill may have five legislative days to revise and extend their remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas, for five days, on account of illness.

To Mr. BENNET, for five days, on account of important business.

## MONTICELLO.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I want to state to the House, as perhaps Members probably know, that a bill has been pending before the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for some time looking to the purchase of Monticello. The committee decided a day or two ago to visit Monticello on next Saturday. As many members of the committee and as many Members of the House as would like to go will be welcome, but everybody who goes will be expected to pay his own expenses.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend remarks that I made on the rule brought in this morning.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks on the rule considered this morning. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## ELECTION TO COMMITTEES.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to present for nomination to the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress the name of Hon. TINSLEY WHITE RUCKER, of the eighth congressional district of Georgia.

The SPEAKER. Are there any other nominations?

There were no other nominations.

The report was agreed to, and Mr. RUCKER was declared elected to the two committees mentioned.

## UNIVERSAL MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on universal military service.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on universal military service. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## HOUSE BILL 386 (H. REPT. NO. 964, PT. 2).

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON], a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, may be permitted to file minority views on House bill 386 within the next 10 days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON], a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, have 10 days in which to file minority views on House bill 386. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on international commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

## DEATH OF ADMIRAL DEWEY.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolutions, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES,  
January 17, 1917.

## House resolution 454.

*Resolved*, That the House has learned with profound grief of the death of the Admiral of the Navy, George Dewey, who has served his country brilliantly for more than 62 years.

*Resolved*, That the Speaker of the House is directed to transmit to the bereaved family a copy of these resolutions and an assurance of the sympathy of the House in the loss they have sustained.

*Resolved*, That the Speaker of the House appoint a committee of seven Members to confer with a like committee of the Senate, and, after consultation with the family of the deceased, to take such action as may be appropriate in regard to the public funeral of Admiral Dewey.

The resolutions were agreed to.

The SPEAKER appointed the following committee: Mr. PADGETT, Mr. TALBOTT, Mr. ESTOPINAL, Mr. RIORDAN, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, and Mr. BROWNING.

The Clerk read the further resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased this House do now adjourn.

The resolution was agreed to; accordingly the House (at 5 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, January 18, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

## EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, reports on preliminary examination and survey of Rainy River, with a view to removing obstructions in the channel at Ranier; and Rainy Lake, with a view to the construction of a breakwater at Ranier to form a shelter harbor at the western end of the lake (H. Doc. No. 1942); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with illustrations.

2. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of appropriation for inclusion in some deficiency bill or the sundry civil appropriation bill (H. Doc. No. 1943); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, submitting an additional estimate of appropriation for St. Elizabeth's Hospital, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1944); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 5916) authorizing an investigation to determine the true north and west boundaries of the Warm Springs Reservation in Oregon, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1302), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DEWALT, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 7556) to grant to the Mahoning & Shenango Railway & Light Co., its successors and assigns, the right to construct, complete, maintain, and operate a combination dam and bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River near the borough of Lowellville, in the county of Mahoning and State of Ohio, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1303), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. NEELY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 789) providing for an additional judge for the district of Montana, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1310), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. STEAGALL, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6207) for the relief of Isabel E. Rockwell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by

a report (No. 1305), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROWNING, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 17406) for the relief of Eugene Fazzi, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1306), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEPHENS, of Mississippi, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 3743) to reimburse John Simpson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1307), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDMONDS, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4807) for the relief of James W. Cross, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1308), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STEAGALL, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (S. 4384) providing for the refund of duties collected on flax-preparatory machines, parts, and accessories imported subsequently to August 5, 1909, and prior to January 1, 1911, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1309), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11498) making an appropriation to compensate James M. Moore for damages sustained while in the service of the Government of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1311), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 20185) for the relief of Horace G. Knowles, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1312), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8573) for the relief of the estate of John C. Phillips, deceased, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1313), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MILLER of Delaware, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19978) for the relief of Janna Stoppels, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1314), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

#### ADVERSE REPORTS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. FOSTER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 11284) for the relief of the Gilroy Winery & Distillery Co., Gilroy, Cal., reported the same adversely, accompanied by a report (No. 1304), which said bill and report were laid on the table.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 20202) authorizing the erection of a building for the housing and accommodation of Government-owned automobiles on the Federal building site at Plymouth, Mass.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 20203) providing for an advisory referendum by the people of the District of Columbia on certain questions relating to municipal self-government and representation in Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RANDALL: A bill (H. R. 20204) to establish rates of postage on second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MILLEP of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 20205) to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in cold-storage food products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 20206) for an equestrian statue of William Frederick Cody (Buffalo Bill); to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MURRAY: A bill (H. R. 20207) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Coalgate, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 20208) to aid navigation and control floods on the boundary waters of Minnesota, North Dakota, and South Dakota; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. WEBB: A bill (H. R. 20209) to amend section 276 of an act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Ohio: Resolution (H. Res. 452) requesting the Ways and Means Committee to report a bill repealing the act of October 3, 1913, and restoring the provisions of the act of August 5, 1909, for providing revenue for the Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SUMNERS: Resolution (H. Res. 453) authorizing the payment of \$600 to Sebe Newman for extra services rendered in connection with the sending out of blanks, receiving, filing, and compiling expense statements filed by candidates for Representatives in Congress in accordance with H. R. 2958, of the Sixty-second Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. RAINEY: Resolution (H. Res. 455) directing the Secretary of War to make a survey of the bar in Lake Michigan in front of Lake Bluff naval station, Illinois; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 340) to investigate dealings on Wall Street and the New York Stock Exchange; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GRAY of New Jersey: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 341) to provide for a conference of representatives of the Army and Navy of the United States and of representatives of the Department of Public Instruction and the National Guard organization of each of the several States of the Union for the purpose of devising a uniform system of public-school instruction and training in military and naval science, to be reported to the Sixty-fifth Congress, and to provide the necessary expenses for said conference; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCKELLAR: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 342) creating offices of congressional examiners; to the Committee on Expenditures in the State Department.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 20210) granting a pension to Christ Clausen; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 20211) granting a pension to George B. Robinson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BENEDICT: A bill (H. R. 20212) granting a pension to Lou M. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOOHER: A bill (H. R. 20213) granting an increase of pension to James G. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: A bill (H. R. 20214) granting a pension to Henry J. Schlosser; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHIPERFIELD: A bill (H. R. 20215) granting a pension to Joseph J. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 20216) for the relief of James M. Connally; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DENISON: A bill (H. R. 20217) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Eckols; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EAGLE: A bill (H. R. 20218) for the relief of the estate of Thomas J. Roberts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELSTON: A bill (H. R. 20219) granting a pension to William D. Cole; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERRIS: A bill (H. R. 20220) for the relief of J. C. McConnell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORDON: A bill (H. R. 20221) for the relief of Samuel Davis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 20222) granting a pension to Elizabeth W. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 20223) granting a pension to Peter McLaughlin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 20224) for the relief of Levi S. Conright; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEARNS: A bill (H. R. 20225) granting an increase of pension to George W. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20226) granting an increase of pension to Irving A. Hubbard; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 20227) granting an increase of pension to Ingabow Falls; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: A bill (H. R. 20228) to renew patent No. 25909; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 20229) for the relief of Eleonora Moore; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20230) for the relief of Hugh A. Erast; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 20231) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20232) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Grandstaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20233) granting an increase of pension to Stewart Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20234) granting an increase of pension to Frank Shaver; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20235) granting a pension to Anna Hall Richmond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20236) granting a pension to Miller Kincaid; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 20237) granting an increase of pension to Gustave Pinksohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 20238) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Grandstaff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20239) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20240) granting an increase of pension to Stewart Wells; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 20241) granting a pension to Harriett A. Boles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 20242) granting an increase of pension to George E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 20243) granting an increase of pension to Ezra H. Keniston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH: A bill (H. R. 20244) granting a pension to Elizabeth M. Keefe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20245) granting a pension to Albert Krick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20246) granting an increase of pension to Carrie C. Washburn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 20247) granting a pension to George W. Paul; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 20248) granting an increase of pension to Edwin A. Jeffries; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BACHARACH: Petition of Junior Order of American Mechanics, of Hackensack, N. J., in re work of the Bureau of Naturalization and extra appropriation of \$30,000; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARNHART: Petition of citizens of the United States in favor of reduction of high cost of living; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Memorial of Bronx Chamber of Commerce, indorsing the Post Office bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of National Association of Vicksburg Veterans, in re national reunion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Life Underwriters' Association, of New York, indorsing House bill 19617; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Marlin Arms Co., in re "preparedness"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Central Bronx Taxpayers' Association, in re postal service in Bronx; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CANNON: Petition of publishers of Danville Searchlight, of Danville, Ill., and Machinist Lodge 4739, Danville, opposing House bill 18986 and Senate bill 4429; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of 22 citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., for national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOOLING: Memorial of New York State Fish, Game, and Forest League, in re game conservation; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of New York State Fish, Game, and Forest League, favoring the enactment of a Federal law which shall permit the promulgation of regulations fixing uniform bag limits and prohibiting the sale of domestic game throughout the United States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Junior Order of American Mechanics, of Hackensack, N. J., favoring the using of moneys received from the naturalization of aliens for their education; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FLYNN: Memorial of New York State Fish, Game, and Forest League, in re methods of control of game supply; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of sundry citizens, opposing various prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany House bill 20052, for relief of Samuel P. Buns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany House bill 20057, for relief of Christian Bechtel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petitions of rural letter carriers of the seventeenth Pennsylvania district; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of Board of Education of Chicago, favoring the Smith-Hughes vocational education bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Bricklayers, Masons, and Plasterers' International Union, Local No. 11, of La Salle and Peru, Ill., opposing the Shields and Phelan water-power bills; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of executive committee of the National Housewives League, favoring the Stephens-Ashurst price-maintenance bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Board of Temperance, Prohibition, and Public Morals of the Methodist Episcopal Church, favoring legislation to exclude from the mails liquor advertisements; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Moulders' Union, of Peru, Ill., opposing the mail-exclusion bills (H. R. 18986 and S. 4429); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Rotary Club of Ottawa, Ill., favoring the Chamberlain bill (S. 1695), for universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorial of American Federation of Teachers, in re House bill 19119; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of Brotherhood of Maintenance-of-way Employees, in re eight-hour law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HADLEY: Petition of Woman's Rural Club of Kent, 25 people of Port Angeles, and 52 people of Quilcene, Wash., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAMILTON of New York: Papers to accompany House bill 13303, for relief of Samuel Massey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELGESEN: Petition of sundry citizens and church organizations of Bowesmont, Drayton, and Galesburg, N. Dak., favoring national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH: Memorial of Henry Bennett and 57 other citizens of East Liverpool, Ohio, against prohibition and mail-exclusion bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of John J. McKeenie and 25 other post-office clerks and carriers, of East Liverpool, Ohio, asking for wage increase; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of W. S. Conger, manager, The Evening Index, San Bernardino, Cal., opposing House bill 17290 and Senate bill 6925, providing for registration of designs; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Albert M. Brobst, Chula Vista, and other veterans of the Civil War, favoring Townsend Civil War veterans' retirement bill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of William H. Rogers, State organizer, U. N. Association, Holtville, Cal., favoring passage of House bill 17896 and House bill 6915; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KETTNER: Petition of A. Reynolds, jr., cashier, United States National Bank, San Diego, Cal., favoring House bill 17606, the Kitchen bill, amendment to Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of William E. Colby, secretary, Board of Directors of Sierra Club, San Francisco, Cal., favoring appropriation of \$300,000 for Yosemite Park, enlargement of Sequoia National Park, and creation of Grand Canyon National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Patrick Flynn, secretary, Marine Firemen, C. & W. U. O. T. P., and John Tennison, secretary, Sailors' Union of the Pacific, San Francisco, Cal., favoring new marine hospital building at San Francisco; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of F. G. Havens, El Centro, Cal., favoring change in House bill 406; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of J. R. Molony, president, Insurance Federation of California, San Francisco, Cal., opposing insurance section of Post Office appropriation bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of Norman S. Dayton, Palm Springs, Cal., and James P. Cadman, San Diego, Cal., opposing rider in Post Office bill re postal rate according to distance for second-class matter; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Arthur H. Marston, the Marston Co., San Diego, Cal., favoring 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of A. Morris Carey, of Baltimore, opposing universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Maryland, opposing prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Julius Gutman & Co., of Baltimore, Md., opposing prohibition in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLER of Pennsylvania: Petition of 48 citizens of Greenville, Pa., for national constitutional prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of sundry citizens, opposing prohibitory measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petition of citizens of Hartford County, Conn., opposing mail-exclusion and prohibition bills pending before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition of sundry citizens, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PRATT: Petition of Charles E. Turnbull, of Addison, N. Y.; Clarence A. Ketcham, of Lounsbury, N. Y.; and sundry other rural mail carriers of Addison, Lounsbury, Bolivar, Nichols, Prattsburg, Hornell, Arkport, Alpine, and Westfield, all in the State of New York, favoring a reasonable allowance for equipment maintenance and the placing of rural carriers' compensation upon an equitable and specific basis; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Rev. John R. Adams, Henry O. Dorman, Frank P. White, Hon. Warren J. Cheney, and 86 other citizens and voters of Corning, N. Y., favoring legislation for national prohibition and other prohibition measures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of Church Federation of Los Angeles, indorsing the Randall bill excluding liquor advertising from the mails; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petitions of sundry citizens, in favor of national prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WARD: Petition of Rev. W. J. Clarke Agnew and other residents of High Falls, N. Y., in favor of the passage of several prohibition measures now before Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WASON: Petition of Mrs. Lilly C. Howes, Mrs. Eleanor Hall, Mrs. Gady M. Wilkins, Mrs. Julia B. Robbins, Mrs. Alicia C. Newton, Mrs. Juliet M. Lawrence, Mrs. Helen M. Fisher, Mrs. Lillie E. Plummer, Mrs. Obed M. Gordon, Mrs. John S. Blair, Bertha K. Whipple, Grace G. Blodgett, Mary Caroline Blair, Harriet Carpenter, Mrs. Bernice L. Brennan, Mrs. Jennie L. Holman, Mrs. Maud Marshall, Mrs. Carrie L. Bliss, Mrs. Elizabeth U. Fletcher, Mrs. Lillian E. Winters, Mrs. Isabella M. White, Mrs. Mary L. Towns, Mrs. Myra A. Fairbanks, Mrs. Lolie R. Pierce, Mrs. Effie E. Hayden, Ethel Farnsworth, and Mrs. Elise C. Schaff, all residents of Fitzwilliam, N. H., favoring equal political privileges for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Petitions of Rev. Calvin Delony and 6 other citizens of East Greenville, Pa.; Henry S. Hunsbeyer and 10 other members of the Montgomery County Christian Endeavor Union; and William S. Clapp and 6 other citizens of Skippack, Pa., requesting the passage of House joint resolutions 84 and 85; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WINSLOW: Petitions of citizens of Worcester, Mass., protesting against antiliquor legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 18, 1917.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, a thousand years in Thy sight are but as yesterday when they are past, and our years, how swift they fly! We are swept into the great current of Thine own vast eternity. Yet our years are related to Thy eternity. We come to Thee in the midst of the sorrow of the Nation on the death of one of the national heroes. We bless Thee to-day that Thou hast laid Thy hand from time to time upon men who in the crises of our national history have served us well, that Thou hast prepared them before for the coming crisis, and that Thy hand is seen in every turn of the affairs of our national life. We bless Thee that Thou hast led us on. We see to-day how dependent we are upon Thy guidance, and Thy providence, and Thy care to prepare mighty men for the issues of our national life. We

pray that we may put ourselves under Thy command and in Thy control, and that we may be guided by the Divine counsel to accomplish God's great purpose in us as a Nation. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

### WHITE-PINE BLISTER RUST (S. DOC. NO. 683).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture submitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for inclusion in the Agricultural appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1918, under the Bureau of Plant Industry, for the eradication or control of the white-pine blister rust, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

### FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

Alice O. Munn, widow of Daniel W. Munn, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 680);

Julia F. Haskell, widow of Edward P. Haskell, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 681); and

Laura Long, widow of Silas Long, deceased, *v.* United States (S. Doc. No. 682).

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

### SENATOR FROM INDIANA.

Mr. WATSON. I take pleasure in presenting the credentials of Senator elect HARRY S. NEW, of Indiana, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and placed on the files of the Senate.

The credentials are as follows:

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 7th day of November, 1916, HARRY STEWART NEW was duly chosen by the qualified electors of the State of Indiana a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1917.

Witness his excellency our governor, James P. Goodrich, and our seal hereto affixed at Indianapolis, Ind., this 15th day of January, in the year of our Lord 1917.

[SEAL.]

By the governor:

JAMES P. GOODRICH, Governor.

E. O. JACKSON,  
Secretary of State.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 186) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue temporary permits for additional diversions of water from the Niagara River.

The message also transmitted resolutions of the House on the death of Admiral Dewey, and announced that the Speaker of the House had appointed Mr. PADGETT, Mr. TALBOTT, Mr. ESTOPINAL, Mr. RIORDAN, Mr. BUTLER, Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts, and Mr. BROWNING a committee on the part of the House to attend the funeral of the late Admiral Dewey.

### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 1093) to permit the Denison Coal Co. to relinquish certain lands embraced in its Choctaw and Chickasaw coal lease and to include within said lease other lands within the segregated coal area, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. JONES. I have a letter in the nature of a petition from Dr. Aline Bradley, legislative superintendent of the Fourth Division Drys, of Fairbanks, Alaska, setting out the conditions there and the result of the vote at the last election. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOURTH DIVISION DRYS,  
Fairbanks, Alaska, December 29, 1916.

HON. WESLEY L. JONES,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: You are aware that Alaska voted dry on November 7 by a majority of more than 2 to 1 in her four judicial divisions.

You will admit that when the Alaska of dance-hall, gambling, and saloon fame thus registers her protest against the liquor traffic—when more than 8,000 voters out of approximately 12,000 sign their names to such a gigantic petition against alcohol, the petitioners are entitled to their demand.

Make no mistake—liquor has had the ruling hand in Alaska, as well as the robbing hand, hence the vote against it, which vote was not simply